

1215  
625.c  
2

A  
D E F E N C E

OF THE

Grammatical Commentaries

Against the

A N I M A D V E R S I O N S

O F

Mr. *EDWARD LEEDS*,

Master of *Bury School*,

Under the Name of

(A N O L D M A N,

And who that *O L D M A N* is, if it be worth  
while to look the following Pages will  
Discover)

---

By *Richard Johnson*, M. A. Author of the said *Commen-  
taries*, and Schoolmaster at *Kensington*.

---

*Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis  
Tempus eget* —————

---

L O N D O N :

Printed for *S. Keeble*, at the *Turk's-Head*, over against  
*Fetter-Lane* in *Fleetstreet*. MDCCVII.

DEFENCE

General Committee

ANIMALS

MR. EDWARD

(AN OLD MAN)

and to look the table

and to look the table

and to look the table

and to look the table

and to look the table

N  
ra  
on  
m  
D  
fo  
fo  
th  
ve  
in

th  
fo  
up  
No



A  
D E F E N C E  
O F T H E  
*Grammatical Commentaries, &c.*

**A**BOVE three Years ago I publish'd my Specimen of *Grammatical Commentaries*, and above a Year since, the Book it self, *i. e.* the first part of it. The design of it is to shew the National Grammar we have at present, to be an insufferable Grievance, and to lay a Foundation for a better, not only than that, but than any yet Extant, or than can be made of all that is to be found upon that Subject. This Design oblig'd me to take Notice of all the Errors and Deficiencies of all Grammarians by Name, that had wrote before me; and, amongst a great deal of better Company, those of Mr. Leeds. Wherefore, ever since he has been venting his Nature upon me in Private, and now at last in Publick, in these *Animadversions*.

I know not well what to say in excuse for troubling the World with a squabble, about the Reputation of one so little as my self; but that the success of a Design depends upon it, which my Adversary owns to be a *Good and Noble Undertaking*, p. 55. *to be gone about the right way,*

p. 2. pursu'd with great diligence, and to deserve Encouragement and Thanks and Honour from all good Men, p. 56. had it not been for some Exceptions that he takes at it, which yet are not such, but that if my Reading falls into the hands of Wise and Judicious Workmen, by the Discoveries I have made, may be made such a Grammar, as, peradventure no Nation in the World ever yet saw; p. 56. And again, p. 44. he says, Mr. Johnson, without all doubt, has taken a singular deal of Pains in doing what he has done, and ought to be commended and thank'd for the Discoveries he has added to those, made by others who writ before him. Well, one wou'd have thought that all this might have procur'd a Man fair Quarter, or at least a little Civil Usage, if he had happen'd to fall into a few Errors. I say a few Errors, for this Character and many, cannot stand together. But Mr. Leeds has a trick worth two of that: He has not liv'd in the World all this while to so little purpose, as not to know the surest way to fasten a Slander, is to give a few good words along with it, that the same Justice which appears in one, may seem to govern the other also; and that there is no such effectual way of Reproaching, as commending it with a but. And therefore I am sensible, says he, p. 55. I have not treated Mr. Johnson with that respect that a Man of such a Good and Noble Undertaking ought to have been; but he has managed the matter with so much Crack and Vanity, so like a Mountebank, or Knight Errant, as has been before intimated; (by intimated you must here understand spoken as plainly and publickly as words can be spoken, that is calling Don Quixot, Ho Mr. Johnson, little Mr. Johnson, that exalt my self, and lessen the Reputation of that incomparable Man, Vossius. If I had called this open Proclaiming, bare Intimating, I should have been told I understood not the English Dictionary as well as the Latin Grammar, &c.) that I thought it the best way to deal with him as I have done, hoping thereby to bring him to a true measure of himself; that in that part of his Commentaries, which he has to publish, we may see nothing but his great diligence (not a word of

Mr. Leeds

Mr. Leeds, that is, nor of *Vossius*, for Mr. Leeds's sake) in reading over the *Classick Authors*, and making such *Observations* out of them, as a *Cautious and Wise Man* would make: in which good *Undertaking*, every good *Man* is ready to *Encourage* him, and to *Thank and Honour* him when he has done. Well, this at least is fair dealing, he lets me see what I have to trust to; there is no *Encouragement*, no *Thanks* to be expected, if I go on to *Tax Mr. Leeds* as I have done. 'Twas unfortunate for me, that I did not understand Mr. Leeds had such an *Interest* in all good *Men*, that the naming of him would prevent all *Encouragement*, though the *Work* were for the *Publick Service*, a *Good and Noble Undertaking* gone about the *Right way*, cost a *singular deal* of *Pains*, deserv'd *Thanks and Honour*, but for this unlucky *Miscarriage*; nay, and for all that, contain'd such *Discoveries*, as in the hands of *Wise and Judicious Workmen*, (of which *One* will always be ready, I suppose, as long as Mr. Leeds lives) may be made such a *Grammar*, as peradventure no *Nation in the World* ever yet saw. Now suppose in such a *Work* as this, there be a little *Vanity*, or more than a little, yet that is easily separable from the rest of the *Book*. And I have declared already that I intend to separate it; and when the other part is done, to come at last to Mr. Leeds's *Terms*, meer *Rule and Example*, not a word of Mr. Leeds, for which reason he prefers the *Abridgment* to the *Specimen*. And in the mean time, if it be so fulsome as he makes it, there is no danger of its tainting any body; it can only serve to expose me, and for that I suppose Mr. Leeds has no such great concern. Why then could he not have a little patience till that was done? Because his *Name* stood upon *Record* in the mean time, and tho' none of his *Scholars* should happen to get the *Book*, and see that they had been often whipt for their *Master's Ignorance*, yet some of his *Neighbours* might, and others certainly wou'd, and so he might not pass for that *Great Grammarian*, which he had set up for. But supposing again, that I had been vain, ought not the *Discoveries* I had made,



*made, and that with a singular deal of Pains, and the Materials I had brought together for a better Grammar, than any ever yet seen, although I had neither the Wisdom nor Judgment to be the Master Builder of my own Materials, to have been some small Apology for me with Mr. Leeds? Ought not all this Pains, and all that Benefit the World may receive from them, if Mr. Leeds would be so kind to bestow his Wisdom and Judgment in the Workmanship, to have expiated for a little Vanity, nay, or a great deal either? I do not mean so far, as not to have told me of any Errors I had committed, but to have done it at least without reproachful Language, as I had done by him, and not to have fallen upon me with so much ill Manners, so many pert and threadbare Jest, which every snarling Scribler has at his Fingers ends, except some that are too mean for any body but Mr. Leeds. Ought not Mr. Leeds of all Men to have considered poor Flesh and Blood, and what a Temptation it must needs be to little Mr. Johnson, in any thing to out-do the great Mr. Leeds? Well, but Mr. Leeds has an excuse for all this. He says he is sensible he has not treated me with that respect, which a Man of so Good and Noble an Undertaking ought to have been, but I have managed the matter with so much Crack and Vanity, so like a Mountebank, or Knight Errant, that he thought it best to deal with me this way, that he might bring me to a true measure of my self.*

---

*Felicia tempora quæ te  
Moribus opponunt, habeat jam Roma pudorem,  
Tertius è cælo cecidit Cato.*

That in the rest of my *Commentaries* which I have yet to publish, nothing may be seen but my great Diligence in reading over the *Classicks* (not a word of Mr. Leeds) and making such Observations out of them as a Wise and cautious Man would make. Very grave Advice, and very Magisterial,

---

*Dii te Damasippe deaque  
Verum ob consilium donent consore.*

But

But after all, Vanity is an ugly thing, and I own it as freely as Mr. Leeds, and am very far from pretending (tho' for the Sale of my Book, which has cost me a very great deal of Money (the least Penny in the Printing of it) I have readily laid hold of Mr. Leeds's Commendation) that the Pains I have taken in this Subject, will at all Privilege me to magnifie my self, who have nothing to boast of but a poor Drudgery, much less to lessen the Reputation of any other Man, least of all that of Gerard Vossius, a Man as far before me, as I am before my meanest Scholar. And if there be any thing in my Book that looks another way, I disclaim it, as being the Child of Inadvertency, and not of Design. Whether this be so or no, shall be consider'd by and by: In the mean time I think Mr. Leeds of all Men ought not to have twitted with it, if it had been so, for several Reasons. First because

*Turpe est doctori cum culpa redarguit ipsum;*

And if this be not the Case here, I must confess I have less Judgment than Mr. Leeds allows me. For what but vanity could inspire him with that freak in his Title Page?

(B Y

## AN OLD MAN,

And who that OLD MAN is, if it be worth while to look, the following Pages will discover).

Is not this as much as to say with old Evander,

*O mihi praeferitos referat si Jupiter annos*

*(Qualis eram cum primam aciem Praeneste sub ipsa*

*Stravi, scutorumq; incendi victor acervos:*

*Et regem hanc Herilum dextrâ sub tartara misi,*

*Nascen-*

*Nascenti cui tres animas Feronia mater*

*(Horrendum dictu) dederat : terna arma movenda,*

*Ter letho sternendus erat : cui tunc tamen omnes*

*Abstulit hac animas dextra, & totidem exiit armis).*

*Non ego, &c.*

Well, but where are the Victories and Laurels of these younger days? His *Vossius Contractus* is of Forty Years standing. He was no OLD MAN then, nor a very Young one. And what a Performance that is, may be seen by the Faults that have been found in it already, beside all that are yet to come. But he says he had no other design, but to contract *Vossius*. Well, I confess this was a very modest design, to content himself with contracting another Man's Works, and it was a great Vanity for little Mr. Johnson to pretend to go further. But why should Mr. Leeds have no other design than to contract *Vossius*? Does not *Vossius* prove all the great Men before him to be out in many things, and was it not to be supposed, in a thing of such vast variety and intricacy, he might in some things be so too? Was it not to be try'd at least whether he were or not? Was it a design great enough for a great School-Master to content himself with shrinking a Book, to put it upon the Nation for a Supplement to the Grammar, without endeavouring to make it hold Water? And to let it stand so Forty Years together, is still a greater Proof of a profound Modesty, and that is all. And now what is become of this mighty *Qualis eram*, imply'd in this vain and freakish Title-Page! But is it true, as here pretended, p. 29. that Mr. Leeds intended only the Contraction of *Vossius*? Nothing like it. He took it for a compleat Supplement to *Lilly*, and says that for that end he had taken the Assistance of *Farnaby* also, and had added something, to speak modestly, out of his own *inopia*. Thus he recommends it to the Reader, in his Preface to him. Take it in his own words, *Sed missis Athenis, ad Spartam nostram, ubi etsi Vossius regnat praeipuus, non tamen solus : in auxilium adiunximus nostratrem Farnabium, atque ubi opus erat, addidimus etiam*



ex nostra inopiâ. Atqui eo ordine omnia, ut quisque in  
*Regia Grammaticâ* non omnino peregrinus nihil desideret,  
 nisi ad manum habeat. And soon after, *Non nobis est mos,*  
*neq; debet, inania jactare:* Nonnihil autem speramus admo-  
 dum pauca esse in veterum libris, quæ studiosæ juventuti in-  
 ter legendum solent gradum sistere, quæ hinc, si probe atten-  
 datur, tantum luminis accipiant, ut quicumque hæsitabit,  
 quomodo pedem expedire queat, facile videat. This then was  
 Mr. Leeds's Design, and I believe, upon second Thoughts,  
 he will find it best to own it, though I think it is plain by  
 the *Commentaries* he has come very short of it. Ano-  
 ther shrewd sign of Mr. Leeds's Vanity, is his pretended  
 Concern for Gerard Vossius. For if it were real, how comes  
 it that he has not duell'd Olaus Borrichius, as well as me,  
 who has long since publish'd a little Dictionary against  
*Vossius de Vitiis Sermonis Latini*, in which he has prov'd be-  
 yond all exception hundreds of words to be genuine Latin,  
 which Vossius condemns as spurious, and many of them by  
 numerous Examples, and if need were, I could add more  
 to some of them? From whence it is plain, what I assert of  
 his *Ars Grammatica*, namely, that this great Man did not read  
 over the Authors he cites for this Work neither. This  
 Author indeed uses Vossius but scurvily, and triumphs  
 over him more than a little. How comes it then that he  
 has escap'd this great Measurer, and not been brought to a  
 true Measure of himself? Why Mr. Leeds had no concern  
 in the Matter, he had never contracted Vossius de Vitiis Ser-  
 monis, and therefore the Reputation of poor Gerard, as he  
 calls him, very wittily, to sling an Odium upon me, must  
 look to it self; Mr. Leeds will not draw for it, but in a  
 Party Concern, where the Contractor is in danger of being  
 run through behind the Original. And now I must desire  
 Mr. Leeds to lend me his jest; Alas poor Gerard! Where-  
 fore all this stir about Vossius, is nothing but entring his  
 own Action in another Man's Name, all meer self, such  
 an intractable Vanity as will not endure touching, though  
 for the Publick Service, as shall be shewn by and by;

B

Nay,

Nay, though he has invited his Reader to it, in these words of his Preface, *Quod si aliquando dormitamus, aurem cuivis Apollini vellicandum præbemus: Neque enim fas est, ut supinam inertiam, quam in aliis odimus, in nobis ipsis amemus.* Further, if Mr. Leeds has so little vanity, as he would fain persuade us, why is he so singular and affected to write his Name three several ways in this one Book, *Leedes* in the Title Page, *e Leodibus* the bottom of his Dedication, and *Ledys* at that of his Preface to the Reader, and *Leodius* elsewhere in a Fourth? This looks like a pretending to something more than Ordinary, a very agreeable variety, and much in use among the old Masters of Roman Eloquence of his Acquaintance. Why do we find among his Examples for Boys Exercise, that Boys came out of York to Bury School. This is something so like Vanity, a Man would swear 'twere the same. And as these are Arguments of a general Vanity, such an one as was sufficient to keep Mr. Leeds from throwing the first Stone at me, though he had found me tripping in this way, so there are other Proofs also of that particular Vanity which he charges me with, namely, the calling great Men to an account for their Errors, as in plain, from the following Passages in his *Vossius Contractus*, under the following Names.

Donatus.

*Quod multis exemplis probari potest (nempe sales significare condimentum etiam) contra Donatum in illud Terentii, Eun. Ac. 3. Sc. 1. p. 28.*

Erasmus, Jo. Scaliger.

*Quidam ex neotericis usurpant idem cum præpositione, atque hi magni nominis. Erasmus Annot. Matth. c. 4. — Et Joseph. Scaliger, castigationibus in spheram contra usum veterum — qui vel &c, vel qui dixerunt post idem. p. 136.*

Farnaby.

*Itidem assentor &c assentior ut statuit Farnabius, sed malletm his postponere personam in dativo, p. 149. Farnabius vult esse Hellenismum, quæ condonabitur, pro quæ condonabuntur, sed quid opus? p. 160.*

Lambinus

Lambinus.

Ubi Lambinus ait Plautum duas loquendi formas diversas confudisse, — sed fortasse melius sanetur constructio si addas, &c. p. 194.

Priscianus.

Sed hanc opinionem duplici telo jugulavit Priscianus, sine lib. 16. Primum quod jungitur (nempe equidem) cum ego; sed hoc debile argumentum, &c. p. 113.

Probus.

Eja producere penultimam ait Probus, — sed rutilius corripit censemus, &c. p. 224.

Rimicius.

Ideoq; nimis audet Rimicius, qui in fabula Æsopi de muliere & gallinâ — non erubuit, &c. p. 61.

Scaliger.

Nam audacior est Scaligeri mutatio, munerat, pro focilat. p. 215.

Servius.

Equidem putatur à Servio 1. Æneid. ab ego & quidem esse conflatum, sed hanc opinionem duplici telo jugulavit Priscianus, p. 113. E quibus exemplis satis refutatur Servii sententia, p. 125. Ubi Servius adglomerant pro adglomerantur, sed facilius subaudias se, p. 153. Nec audiendus Servius qui aliter sciivit, p. 161.

Saturnius.

Saturnius, l. 9. c. 5. Vult comparativa cum exponuntur per quàm regere interdum Genitivum, ad imitationem Græcorum, sed loca quæ adducit, non id probant, p. 152, 153.

Smetius.

Sic versus ille legitur in MSS. licet aliter citet Henricus Smetius, p. 127.

Stephanus.

Legas etiam Chremes, & Chreme; Socrates, & Socrate; Uliesses & Uliisse; licet id negat Stephanus. And a little below, Nescio quibus autoribus ductus producit (nempe e in Achille vocativa) Stephanus.



Valla.

*Tantum monendi studiosi, ne, quæ tradidit, Laur. Valla de Comp. & sup. ea temerè recipiunt, p. 133. sic etiam dicitur ἀδισταῖτες incidere in æs, & in ære, licet Valla aliud visum, p. 184.*

And now what is become of all that Candour and Modesty which Mr. Leeds will have so strictly observ'd towards great Men, who have wrote before us, and for want of which (as he pretends) he endeavours to expose me to the scorn and hatred of his Reader? Have I any where said more than this? Nay, have I any where said so much? Is there any Expression of mine so Imperious, as his of *Servius, nec audiendus Servius*? and yet for all this

*De nobis post hæc tristis sententia fertur,  
Dat veniam corvis, vexat censura columbas.*

I must pass for a sower Reflector upon the failures of great Men, a Mountebank, a Knight Errant, a Man of an unallowable Humour, all Crack and Vanity, a-Ho Mr. Johnson, and many other turns of the like good breeding; and Mr. Leeds for the prettiest condition'd thing in the VWorld, the very most undermost, the Pink of Courtesie. I can see nothing to be said for this, but that great Men may make bold one with another, but that is no Precedent for little Mr. Johnson. VVell, but I reflect upon his *Sacrosanctus*, his incomparable Gerard Vossius, one that help'd him to all his Grammar, and therefore every Fault found in him, is one in Mr. Leeds too, and that's insufferable. 'Tis true, indeed, I take Notice of several Errors in Gerard Vossius, and so does Mr. Leeds of all that he knew. And for matter of Respect, I am sure I mention him every where with as much, as Mr. Leeds himself. I call him what I think him, and always thought him, a great Man; I say, p. 27. that, for his admirable Learning in this kind, in disputable matters, he may pass for an Author. This therefore is the only

rude.

ness, that I should be so pragmatical as to discover more Errors in *Vossius* than Mr. *Leeds* had done; for he himself has discover'd all that he knew: witness p. 23. *Nam aromaites gemma jungitur cum adjectivo Fem. Plin. l. 37. c. 10. licet id non observatum à Lexicographis, qui quidem quod attinet ad gemmarum nomina in as & es incerti videntur quid statuere; neq; (quantum video) satis scii Grammatici, nam aspilates, ostracites, & chalazias, statuit solum masc. etiam Vossius noster, at usurpavit Plinius & feminino. VVell.* I find it was unlucky for me, that I had not contracted *Vossius* before I wrote these *Commentaries*, for that would have made him *Vossius noster*, and then I might have made bold with him, as well as Mr. *Leeds*. Again, p. 47. *Tum ille prognatus Theti pro Thetide, quod fortasse non in animo habuit clarissimus Vossius, cum vitio dedit lepidissimo Erasmo, quod de climati Ægyptiâ, pro climatide, scripserit. Again, p. 73. speaking of the Comparative Degree, he says, Aliquando verò addit imminutionem positivo, ut in illo Maronis, Æneid. 5.*

*Tum senior tales referebat pectore voces.*

*Ita statuit Vossius noster qui interpretatur tristior, subtristis vel ex parte tristis; but what tristior? for he names none. I suppose he means the tristior in that of Virgil,*

*Tristior & lachrymis oculos suffusa nitentes, Æneid. 1.*

(but does not the leaving out this whole Verse, the Interpretation of which is, the thing here in Question, seem to argue the want of a little due care and circumspection in Mr. *Leeds* too, as well as Mr. *Johnson's* suffering a Misprint of 10 for 20. in a Quotation to pass from the *Specimen* to the *Commentaries*.) & *senior, parum vel non satis senex: in hoc nempe secutus Servium, in illo Priscianum: sed qui rem propius spectat, fortasse inveniat (saltem in his locis) quod ab illis magnis viris dissentiat: nam quomodo illa dici potest subtristis,*

*subtristis, vel ex parte tristis, quæ oculos suffuderat lachry mis,*  
*Et tam miseras edidit querelas? aut ille non satis senex, qui*  
*apertè queritur de tarda bebetudine, Et effetis viribus sen-*  
*ectutis?* How fairly he represents his Author shall here be  
 consider'd by and by. In the mean time what is become of  
 Mr. Leeds's Rule which he so modestly prescribes to me? To  
 set the Example of modest Mr. Walker before my Eyes, to  
 name no body, because it looks too much like bragging and  
 boasting, which all modest Men shun the appearance of, what  
 they can. This is (surely as much at least as any thing he  
 can find in me) singling out of great Adversaries, three at  
 once, and one of them that very Vossius, and then proclaim-  
 ing Victory, as he charges me. Priscian, Servius and Vos-  
 sius do but see at a distance, Mr. Leeds is the Man that does  
 propius spectare, see Face to Face; and for his magnis viris,  
 that is but a Complement upon them, to aggrandize him-  
 self, since the greater the Captive, the greater the Tri-  
 umph. This must all follow upon Mr. Leeds's state of the  
 matter, that the naming of great Men argues vain Glory,  
 unless he can shew a special Priviledge. Again, p. 84, 85.  
*Nam in exemplo citato è Terentio, si te animo æquo ferre ac-*  
*cipiet, negligentem feceris, videtur esse Indicativi, quod plu-*  
*ribus exemplis contendit Vossius; in quibus quidem modus*  
*Potentialis (ut nobis videtur) potius debuit habere locum, si*  
*locum ullum in modorum familiâ ille severus modorum censor po-*  
*tentiali concessisset.* Again, p. 105. *At neutra sententia (nempe de*  
*supinis) placet Vossio, qui tertiam fert, nempe derivata à parti-*  
*cipiis præteritis ideo vocari supina, quòd, re gestâ & præteritâ,*  
*liceat nobis esse supinis, & otiosis. Sed utrum ejus sententia sit*  
*probabilior, doctiorum arbitratus esto:* where there is a little due  
 care wanting too, in the word *doctiorum*, for which *docto-*  
*rum* would have done better, since this may be taken for  
*doctiorum Vossio.* Again, p. 163. *Censet Valla post verbum*  
*motus non recte usurpari gerundium. Ideoque non dicendum*  
*revertor ab arando, sed ab aratione: quæ sententia etsi Vos-*  
*sio nostro parum arrideat, non tamen eam, prout nobis videtur,*  
*satis refellit.* Again, p. 192. *Dura etiam Synthesis est illud,*  
 Ter.



Ter. Eun. Qui habet falem quod in te est. Ita enim habent pleriq; M.S.S: Vossius refert [quod] non ad [falem] sed ad [habere falem] an rectè judicat lector. Nobis non magis absurdum videtur dicere, [falem quod] quàm [arcus & calami quæ]. Again, p. 197. In remigro autem acue primam; nam mediam corripit, Ter. Hec. Ac. 4. Sc. 2. quod miror Vossium virum tantâ industriâ præterisse; nam is diserte asserit, in migro nemo priorem, quod scimus corripit. Sed bonus Homerus non semper vigilat, neque Bernardus, etsi satis oculatus videt omnia. I hope it comes to my turn now to use that Pathetical saying of Mr. Leeds, alas poor Gerard. And now if a Man must needs be snarling at other People, one would think it should be in something, which would not bear such ample recrimination, nay something wherein it might be said

*Opprobriis dignum latraverit integer ipse.*

Surely 'tis a long time since Mr. Leeds read his own Book. I have discovered long since, by his putting down *Necavis* as a singularity, which I have given such a Number of Proofs of, and *Crispus* as not compar'd, which I have shewn him twelve times compar'd in *Pliny* (I fancy 'tis so in his *Pliny* too); and several other things, beside what he has blab'd of himself in these Animadversions, that Mr. Leeds has not much troubled his Head with reading the Classics, but I thought he had made amends for that, by diligently reading his own VVorks; but now I find he does not that neither. Surely he had forgot that he thus often exposes Vossius himself, when he reproach'd me for *leading about the dull Dutchman*, or else he will let no body do it but himself, which is something I confess, and what, it may be, Vossius might take as well if he were living, as King Charles II. did a like matter, who being told of a great Officer of his Household that cheated him grievously, reply'd, I know that, but he will let no body else; and so kept him in his Place. But it is said I have misrepresented Vossius.

*Vossius.* VVell, if I have, Mr. Leeds is not a proper Man to tell me of that neither, for he has done so himself. And I hope he will consider how much more excusable it is in me, who had so many other Authors upon my Hands, than in him, who had this one only to mind. His first Correction of *Vossius*, p. 24. *Voss. Contract.* is a meer abuse of of him. For whereas he says there, that *Vossius* determin'd *Aspilates*, *Ostracites*, and *Chalazias* to be Masculine only, 'tis no such matter, but the direct contrary, as plain as words can make it. And to convince Mr. Leeds that I have as much respect for *Vossius*, as he, for his life, I will transcribe the whole Passage in his Vindication. *Similiter virilia sunt pyrites, selenites, aetites, chernites, ostracites, ophites, paranites, aspilates, aliaq; id genus. Plinius lib. 36. c. 17. Chernites ebori simillimus, c. 19. Est alius etiamnum pyrites similitudine xris, c. 20. Hæmatites ustus minii colorem imitatur. Idem tamen in muliebri usus. Ut l. 37. c. 11. Pyrites nigra quidem, sed attritu digitos adurit. Ita & vetus Parmensis editio, & inde consecuta. In quibusdam tamen Manuscriptis, pyritis, ut Græcis ἡ πυρίτις. Ac similiter differunt selenites, & selenitis, ὁ σελενίτις, ἡ σελενίτις. Nempe in priore respiciunt ὁ λίθον, in altero ἡ λίθον. Sed hoc in Plinianis editionibus non observatur. Ut l. 37. c. 1. Pyrrhus habuisse traditur Achaten, in qua novem musæ, & Apollo citharam tenens, spectarentur. Et c. 8. Molochites laudata signis. Et c. 9. Aspilaten Democritus in Arabiâ gigni tradit, ignei coloris. Eam oportere cameli pilo spleneticiis alligari.* And yet to borrow Mr. Leeds's quaint expression upon me, this is the very very very *Aspilates* which, he says, his Author makes only Masculine. And this is still the more strange in Mr. Leeds, since the Example contains a Medicine for the Splenetick: but I suppose Mr. Leeds was in love with the Distemper, and had no mind to be Cured. Neither does he less abuse him in the word *ostracites* and *chalazias*, by saying he makes them only Masculines, for *Vossius* goes on thus, *Ac postea: Botrytes alia nigra est, alia pampinea. Item, Capnites plurimis spi-*

ris fumida. Et mox; Cepites candida est. Ac similia id genus deinceps, which is a plain Reference to Pliny, for more Feminines of this sort, and among others, ostracites and chalazias also. And now in a matter that is not transiently mention'd, but so expressly and copiously insisted upon, how could this great Grammarian say, nam aspilates, ostracites, & chalazias statuit solum Masc. etiam Vossius Noster. Surely I may return him one of his two Complements upon me, namely, either that he Accuses others of saying that which they do not say, that he may be thought the only Man that has instructed the World in the matter he is upon; or that like other Men, he is subject to fits of yawning, and then writes, (as other Men used to such fits commonly do) with his Mouth open, and his Eyes shut. He misrepresents him again, Voss. Contract. p. 47. when he says, Et dixit Plaut. Epid. Ac. 1. Sc. 1. Tum ille prognatus Theti, pro Thetide, quod fortasse non in animo habuit clarissimus Vossius cum vitio dedit lepidissimo Erasmo, quod de climate Egyptiæ, pro climatide scripserit. For Vossius quotes this very Passage of Plautus, but says that Thetide is better; his words are, Nec existimandum perpetuum esse, quod de hujusmodi nominibus traditum est. Nam excipi debent quæ in genitivo crescunt. Sic à Thetis dicimus non Thetidem modo sed etiam Thetin, & Tethin. In ablativo tamen Thetide potius quam Theti: etsi apud Plautum Epidico legatur, Theti prognatus. So that what Vossius censures here in Erasmus, is not the declining any Greek Noun in *s*, which is commonly *crescent*, without encrease, but for declining *clematis* so in particular, for which there was no Authority. And the Censure is judicious, and full of Reason, a dead Language being not to be preserv'd upon other Terms, than a strict adhering to the use of Authors, and not stretching it from particular Cases to a general Rule. The next thing in which he misrepresents his Author, is, Voss. Contract. p. 73. in the Account he gives of the Comparative degree, Aliquando verò addit imminutionem positivo, ut in illo Maronis,



*Tum senior tales referebat pectore voces.*

*Ita statuit Vossius noster*, whereas *Vossius* says no such thing. He says that the *Comparative* sometimes signifies less than the *Positive*, but this is none of his Instances. Nay, he concludes this Argument rather point blank against it. For having Cited out of *Servius*, *Et revera non convenit hunc satis senem accipi, qui & vincere potest, & uno ictu tantum necare*; he says, *Hac Servius. Verum eo, si fortè unum hoc effecerit*, Senior quinto *Aeneidos* imminutionem significare. At nihil illa ad locum de *Priamo*, & *Charonte*, aut eum, quem *è Fabio* adducebamus. Surely, saying if *Servius* cou'd prove it can never make it *Vossius's* Opinion that he has prov'd it, but the quite contrary. And now I hope I shall hear no more from Mr. *Leeds* upon this Head. 'Tis certainly a greater piece of carelessness for a Contractor, that has but one Author to mind, to misrepresent him, than for one engaged as I was, and forced to trust sometimes to my Memory, as being depriv'd by my troubles of the use of my Books, either to mistake one Author for another, or the particular words of this or that Author. And this I hope this angry Gentleman will, upon cooler thoughts, be inclin'd to forgive, when he shall consider that in these Animadversions, the Work of three Years, and yet not taking in above 68 Pages of my Book, he has misrepresented me in the word *Marathon*, of the Feminine use of which he says I take no notice; how truly, let the Reader see *Commentaries*, p. 21. where he will find *mirata est Marathon*, the very Quotation which he says I take no Notice of. He does me the same injury upon the word *Ilion*, which he says I tax him for not shewing in the Feminine, and yet do not do it my self, and yet the very line before his Name, there is

*Tunc cum tristis erat defensa est Ilion armis.*

the very Quotation which he says is wanting, and all this in a Paragraph of five lines. Sure this is *Writing with the Eyes shut*. He charges me also with misrepresenting *Vossius*, upon the word *camelus*, when I say he challenges any Man to shew it in the *Feminine*, and says that *Vossius* challenges no body that he knows of, p. 25. Without all dispute Mr. *Leeds* can best tell what he himself knows in this Matter, and I will take his word that he does not know it, though in his own Author; but to satisfy him that things may be even in the *incomparable Gerard*, which he knows nothing of, let him look *De Anal.* l. 1. c. 15. and there he will find these words, *Non rectius communia faciunt camelus, exul, præsul, pedes, eques, obse, cocles, plurag; alia: quæ si quis malè altero à nobis genere spoliari putet, is gratum fecerit, si veteris scriptoris autoritate comprobarit, posse ea in feminino usurpari. Id si fiat, primus propria cadam vineta; nec metuam nequis probus desertionis inurat notam, modo fuga fiat in castra veritatis.* Now this I take to be a challenge in a Writer; and if it be not, let Mr. *Leeds*, who is so good at *Defining*, tell me what is. Again, upon the word *Pelion*, he says I misrepresent *Vossius*, in saying that he is positive it is never other than *Neuter*. Now *Vossius* says, *Neutra autem sunt desinentia in c tertia, item in on Œ um ut Pelion.* Now when a Grammarian says a Noun is *Neuter*, and takes no Notice of any other Gender, I think he is to be understood that it is only *Neuter*, and that is being *Positive*. And this I fancy is the true interpretation, because I find Mr. *Leeds* interprets so himself. *Vossius* says, *similiter virilia pyrites, &c.* and Mr. *Leeds* say he makes them *Masculine* only, and Censures him for it, though two or three Lines after he says they are *Feminine* also, as has been shewn. I perceive if he had said that *Pelion* was *Masculine* also, I might have said he had been positive it was only *Neuter*. Well, another time I shall know how to please this Gentleman, if any thing will please him. And thus much for Mr. *Leeds* upon this head of misrepresenting. But there is a satisfaction due

to the Reader also. To him therefore I say, that I am sorry for any mistake that has escap'd me in this Work, and particularly for having misrepresented *Gerard Vossius*, a Man whom I am so far from lessening designedly, that I think him the greatest Man these last Ages ever produc'd, and I have been often amaz'd to see the Mastery he shews in this part of Learning, which of it self is enough to take up the time of an ordinary Capacity, who was a compleat Master also in almost all other Learning. How I come to misrepresent him in two of the three things *Mr. Leeds* charges upon the Specimen, and now amended in the *Commentaries*, viz. as saying, that *Thus* never signified the Tree, and that *Acus* the Fish was Masculine, at this distance of time I cannot tell, having done away the Notes out of which that was Compil'd; but for the third, his saying that *Ador* was Feminine, it is so in the Book which I made use of, and I overlook'd the Correction in the *Errata*, which is no such unheard of Fault. And though *Mr. Leeds* did give Notice of it to one of my Friends, in a Letter before my Book came out, not to admonish, but reproach me, yet my Friend had no Commission to let me have that Letter. He only read it to me once over, and that was not enough to carry away such a Rhapsody of stuff as it contain'd. But it may be the Reader may say, as well as *Mr. Leeds*, what need of naming *Vossius* or any body else?

*First*, Because in all likelihood the Book would have been damn'd without ever looking into it, if this had not been done. For the World has been so possess'd, that *Vossius* (especially coming after *Sanctius*, *Scioppius*, and other great Men) was so compleat on this Subject, that there has been no thoughts but of abridging him for the use of the several Countries: and therefore nothing would have been look'd upon, that did not carry a Face of being in some things beyond him. And I must confess I had so much Vanity, that I was loth my Book should be sold for waste Paper.

*Secondly*,



Secondly, It was requisite to name Names, because many things to be taken notice of wou'd have appear'd impertinent, if the contrary had not been shewn to be maintained by great Men. For example, how impertinent wou'd it have been to have put down four and fifty Examples of *Necavi* from *Neco*, if the great Contractor of *Vossius*, had not put down *Necavit* as a Singularity? How impertinent to have given as many Examples of *Necatus*, if the same great Author had not let *Necui Nectum* pass without Correction. All that had read wou'd have known *Necavi* to be the common Præterperfect of *Neco* without my telling them, but they wou'd not have known there was that Necessity of warning others, unless I had quoted the great Mr. *Leeds*. What need to have told the World that *Crispus* was compar'd eleven times in *Pliny*, once in *Columella*, once in *Solinus*, unless the same great Author had said it was never compar'd at all, &c.

Thirdly, It was requisite to name Names, that People finding their Mistake in the Opinion they had of the Perfection of these great Mens Works, might be excited to make further Enquiry into this Matter, and those of greater Capacities and Advantages than my self, who beside my Incapacity, have been under all the disadvantageous Circumstances that can well be imagin'd. And because this Study has so little Encouragement here in *England*, that this Motive was not likely to go far, it was further requisite to name Names, to stir up the Envious to find fault. And it has had this good Effect already, we see, that the VWorld owes this Learned Treatise of Mr. *Leeds* to it, and the Hopes of more. For he says, *he does not know but he may add*. And then who knows but that three Years more may discover another Fault, as these three last have done one in the word *Sicanis*, which tho' it be but one, yet one thing is something, and every little helps, is as good a Proverb as the best. These were my Reasons for naming of Names, and Mr. *Leeds* may try his Skill upon which he pleases. And thus much for the Vanity

nity Mr. Leeds charges me with in the manner of Management. But he has Objections also against the *Doctrinal Part*, which are next to be consider'd. And in this he says, *I have not taken sufficient Care to prevent the saying of the same thing of my Grammatical Commentaries, that I have said of Lilly's Grammar, namely, that they are in several things false, in some obscure, superfluous in things unnecessary, and defective in things necessary; and that they are so,* he says, shall be plainly and evidently shewn. VVell, this is to the Point, I must needs say, if it can be prov'd, and if plainly and evidently too, there's a short end of the matter, a poor Author undone in one Campaign. But good Reader have a little Patience,

———*Agedum pauca accipe contra,*

and then if it don't appear, that this Author has the least to do with *plainly and evidently* of any Man living, never take my word more. For if my *Commentaries* are in *several things false, in several obscure, &c.* yet if they are not so in as many Instances as *Lilly's Grammar*, the same thing cannot be said of them, as of that. And does Mr. Leeds so much as pretend that they are? Nothing like it. Now here are *plainly and evidently* come to nothing already. The whole Merit of the Cause is upon the Comparative, and that is *plainly and evidently* overlook'd. But 'tis below a great Disputant to be ty'd to Rules. They were made for your little Writers of *Grammatical Commentaries*, not for great Contractors, and such like. But *Falsity, Obscurity, Superfluity and Deficiency* are scurvy things in a Treatise of this Nature, tho' but in part; let us see therefore how far this is made out *plainly and evidently*. But before we come to treat upon this Point, I must desire the settling a Preliminary or two. The first is, that the Extent of the several Books may be consider'd, that of Mr. Leeds's, and mine: For in these Cases, the greater Compass a Man takes, the more liable he

he is to go out of the way. The second is, that some regard may be had to the different way of collecting the Materials. Mr. Leeds's Observations were made to his hand, and except in a very few Cases, where he interposes his own Judgment, he had nothing to do, but to leave out the Examples, and shorten the wording of the Rule. I had my Observations to make out of the Authors themselves, where there is not the least Hint of this kind, but a great deal every where to divert a Man's Thoughts from the manifold Intentions he must carry in his Head through every Sentence, to the Sense of the Subject, or Elegance of the Writer. What it wou'd have been to another Man I know not, but to me it was a great Difficulty, not to be diverted from my Purpose by so many Temptations, but to steer on my Course amidst these Syrens. A third thing is, that my Book being but newly out, I may have a little time allow'd me for Retrospection and second Thoughts, which is but reasonable in a Case of this Nature, where among so many thousand mark'd Passages a Man may well be supposed to have overlook'd some, and in such a Course of reading, to have let others pass without Remark, and yet to have taken reasonable Care that the same thing may not be said of his Book, as of Lilly's Grammar, or of Mr. Leeds's Notes upon it. And surely Mr. Leeds of all Men, must allow this to be a very reasonable Preliminary, whose Book has been out forty Years, with a great deal more amiss in it, uncorrected to this day. I find he pleads this in Excuse, p. 29. that *his Book was written full forty Years ago, and possibly in all that time, after he had writ it, he might see some Faults in it, which he design'd to mend, if the Book came to be printed again.* Now I had always thought that the longer a Book stood uncorrected, where there was need of Correction, the greater Blame lay upon the Author, and that if a great Man had full forty Years given him to attend his Errours, a poor little one, might have had a tenth part, or some such thing, three or four Years at least, and especially



cially in a matter of so much greater Extent, and where the remaining part was yet to be publish'd, in which something might be expected, and toward which more is done already, and left in the Printer's Hands, than Mr. Leeds has done, in these Animadversions, or ever will do, as I fancy. The fourth and last Preliminary is, that he either admit me to an equal share with him, or renounce for himself that Allowance which he takes, pag. 29, 30. namely, that one Mistake may be worse and harder to amend, in the Man that makes it, than another. As in the Case before us, Mr. Leeds had let Nycticorax without any Remark stand where it should not have stood; and added three other as improper for that place, as Nycticorax was. But all this happened through Oscitancy; (you must not suppose he means yawning here, no that is peculiar to Mr. Johnson, and between Oscitancy and Yawning there is a great deal of Difference) or Inadvertency. Wake but the Man, and give him leave to rub his Eyes a little, and he will readily find the Mistake himself, and needs no other Mistake-finder to shew it him. But when, as in Mr. Johnson's Case, the Mistake is made through Ignorance, the Cure of it is much more difficult; it being a great deal harder to convince a mistaking Man (especially if he be a Man that is in love with himself, and his own Conceptions) than to awaken another Man, he be never so fast asleep. And it unluckily happens just thus with Mr. Johnson: He had mistaken the Meaning of the second Special Rule in Lilly's Grammar, thinking the penultima Acutis to have regard to the Greek Accent, and as a Consequent of this Mistake, he made another, in placing Aedon, which is *αιδων* in Greek, after some words in *n*, that were excepted from general Rule, as a word that ought to have been excepted from them. As for the word Aedon, I shall speak to it hereafter; in the mean time, I can never allow Mr. Leeds this Privilege, to be principal God-father on both sides, and to have the naming of his own Child, and mine too. If it was *mif-thinking* in me to place Aedon under the second Special Rule, sure it must be *mif-thinking*, or *unshinking* in Mr.

Mr. Leeds to let *Nycticorax* stand there, which had nothing to do there, and to add *dropax*, *mystax*, *varix*, which had as little. But it seems it was not *mis-thinking*, it must be *unthinking* therefore, and I cannot but think, 'tis a harder matter to convince an *unthinking* Man, than a *mis-thinking* one. I think the first comes much nearer the Animal which Mr. Leeds thinks I take him for, than the other. But whether *mis-thinking*, or *unthinking*, I can never grant him this Privilege, without I may come in for snacks with him. VVhat, a Sleep of full forty Years! VVhy, *Endymion's* was a Nap to it. VVell, 'twas unhappy for me, that I should wake this sleeping Lion, and set him a roaring, that I can't take a Nod for him, *Libertas pauperis hac est*. These are my Preliminaries, and, I think, all very fair ones; these then being granted, let us see what Mr. Leeds has to say against me. I find his main Attack is against the *Specimen*, and against that part of it too, which is amended in the *Commentaries*, which is against the third Preliminary. For if Mr. Leeds thinks it an Excuse, that he might possibly see some Faults in his Book after full forty Years time, which he might, possibly too, design to amend, if the Book came to be printed again; sure I, that have actually amended in so much less time, must be much more excusable. But Mr. Leeds says, I know who told me of these Errors. Well, that I do; and since I see Mr. Leeds will take it kindly, and not for an Abuse, the VVorld shall know it too. VVherefore know all Men by these Presents, That Mr. Edward Leeds, Master of Bury School, has contributed considerably to these *Grammatical Commentaries*, by discovering that *Vossius*, and *Stephens*, and *Despauterius* do not say that *Thus* never signifies the Tree, as I erroneously thought they did. That in the Citation out of *Pliny*, for the Gender of *Acanos*, in which I, to serve my turn, (not having the Fear of God before my Eyes, I suppose, had wilfully and maliciously) left out *Herbam* (tho' he agrees the Feminine Adjective rather respects *Acanos*); I say, that he has discover'd *Herbam* to be left out. Thirdly, That he has

D

shewn

shewn me my Mistake in saying, that *Vossius* thought *Acus* the *Fish*, to be Masculine from that of *Martial*,

*Et satius tenues ducere credis acos.*

Fourthly, That he has discover'd a Correction in the Errata of *Vossius*, which I had not. Fifthly, That he has convinc'd me of a Mistake in the word *Sicanis*, which I heedlessly took to be both Masculine and Feminine. As to what he pretends about the word *Aedon*, it shall be answer'd hereafter, if Mr. *Leeds* insist upon it; and for four of the the other five, I shall discount with him out of his Animadversions, which I think is fair Payment. Now four of these six are amended in the *Commentaries*, and for that Mr. *Leeds* calls them my new *Commentaries*; and for the other two, that stand there still, reproaches me too for not having mended them. This is *habet & musca splenem* indeed. Of this Nature also is what he objects against the Title of the *Specimen*, where I say that *Lilly's Grammar* is in many things false, in most obscure; which last word *most*, he says, *I use meerly because it begins with the same Letter as many, for that Lilly's Grammar is not in most things obscure, tho' it be so in several, and that therefore I shou'd have said some and several, which beginning both with the same Letter also, wou'd have run as well off from the Tongue as many, and most, and have been true also into the bargain.* But this also was alter'd in the *Commentaries*, tho' meerly for the Satisfaction of VVranglers, and not at all because it might not justly be said to be *in most things obscure*. For all the Latin part of it is obscure to Beginners by its being Latin, beside many other Obscurities both in the English and Latin Part, not mentioned in these *Commentaries*, for fear of swelling them to a Bulk which might be justly exceptionable. But Mr. *Leeds* having given up the main Point, namely, that *Lilly's Grammar* is faulty enough to be laid aside, let him make the most of this Objection. Only I hope he will stay to see what I have to say of the remaining part, possibly that  
may



may make up what he fancies to be wanting in this first Part. But Mr. Leeds says, I am no Judge of Obscurity, having condemn'd a clear Definition of Grammar as obscure; namely, *Grammatica est rectè loquendi atq; scribendi Ars*, and advanc'd an obscure one in the room of it; namely, Grammar is the Art of expressing the Relations of things in construction, according to the Custom of those whose Language we learn, with Orthography in writing, and due Accent in speaking. This is a scurvy matter, I must needs say, and what, if it be made out, will bring an Author to a true Measure of himself, as soon as any thing I know again, or at least give others his true Measure. Let us see therefore where this Charge falls.

I say that Lilly's Definition of Grammar, namely, *Grammatica est rectè loquendi atq; scribendi Ars* (which is that of others also as well as his, is obscure, because first the word *Rectè* is a word of very various Signification, and when join'd with the words *Loqui* or *Scribere*, is found in another sense, but never in that here intended, or which ought to have been intended. Now this certainly, if it be true, is a good Objection for the Reasons given in the Commentaries. VVhat says Mr. Leeds then to the contrary? VVhy First, That *Rectè* has but one Signification, and that which every Child almost knows; namely, *well, rightly, or as one ought*. These are brave Boys indeed, I suppose he means his own, and I am sorry I have not Interest enough to beg them a Play-day. All the Dictionaries that I have seen make a great deal to do about the various Significations of the word *Rectè*. Chisletius in his Edition of *Calepine* has sixty Lines upon it; and if after all, the Boys have clear'd it never to signify any thing but *well, rightly, and as one ought*, they deserve Encouragement. But let us pass from the Boys to the Master, and see what he knows in this matter, which will not appear to be at all equal to his Swaggering, at the winding up of the bottom. For *Rectè*, which he says has never any other Signification than *well, rightly, and as one ought*, has

plainly another, and that its *primary* Signification; in that place of Cicero, *Nam si omnes atomi declinabunt, nulla unquam cohaerescunt: sive aliae declinabunt, aliae suo nutu rectè ferentur, primum erit hoc quasi provincias atomis dare, quæ rectè, quæ obliquè ferantur: deinde, &c.* Fin. L. 1. p. 103. And from this *primary* Signification, that *secondary* one, which Mr. Leeds takes notice of, and which with so much Confidence he says to be the only one, is deduced, by comparing *Duty* to a right Line, and its contrary to *Obliquity* or *Deviation* from it, which is also common to other Languages. Now what an *Expositor* is this of the Signification of words, who takes the *secondary* for the *sole*, without any notice of the *Principal*! And as by this Translation, it comes to signify *Duty* in general, or well, rightly, and as one ought, as Mr. Leeds says, so by a further Translation, it is taken also for the particular Matter of that *Duty*. Thus when Pamphilus says of Davus, *Andr. ac. 5. sc. 4. Pater non rectè vinctus est*, he means *non justè vinctus est i. e. non justà causà*, which is the more immediate, as well as the more fix'd and determinate Signification here, than Mr. Leeds's well, rightly, and as one ought, all, or any of which, will give the same room for Simo's Quibble in English, as *Rectè* in Latin, namely, *Haud ita jussi, i. e. That is none of my fault, I am sure I bid them bind him well*. So when Cicero says, *Quoties mihi certorum hominum potestas erit, quibus rectè dem, non præmittam*, by *rectè* is meant *tutè*, as the thing without which it could not be rightly done in those dangerous times. Another way by which this, and other words also, come to have different Significations, is by *Equivalency*, namely, when the Sense is such, that which so ever of the two words you use, 'tis all one in effect, as to the main Sense. Thus in what I quoted out of Terence, *Hee. ac. 3. sc. 2. So. Quid tu igitur lachrimas? aut quid es tam tristis? Pa. Rectè mater*, which Mr. Leeds will have to be as much as *Rectè mones Mater*; You say well Mother, or you advise well; if the Mother advis'd well, then there was nothing for Pam-

philus

*philus* to grieve at, and it is all one as to the main of the Sense, if *Nihil* be suppos'd instead of *Rectè*, as in that other of the same Author, *Eun. ac. 2. sc. 3. Rogo num quid velit. Rectè, inquit, abeo.* Where *Donatus* says, *Rectè pro nihil*; and yet here also it may be explain'd by *Rectè est*, i. e. *nihil deest, ergo nihil aliud volo.* Of the same kind is that of *Suetonius, Vit. Vesp. convivabatur assidue; nec unquam nisi rectè, & dapilè.* Where though *rectè* may be explain'd by *ut decuit*, with respect to some Custom, yet that is but remotely, and at large: its more immediate, and particular signification is *luculenter, opipare, sumptuose*, as appears by *dapilè* which follows, and that remote signification must be explain'd by one of these, to make any thing certain of it. So when *Simo* asks *Ballio, Pseud. Sc. Viso quid rerum, &c.* what *Pseudolus* had said, when he came to understand that he had sold the young Wench to the Soldier, after he had promised to stay while *Callidorus* cou'd raise Money to buy her, he says,

Si. Quid ait? quid Narrat? queso quid dicit tibi?

Bal. Nugas theatri, verba quæ in Comædiis

Solent lenoni dici, quæ pueri sciunt,

Malum, & scelestum, perjurum aiebat esse me.

Si. Pol, haud mentitus. Bal. Ego haud iratus fui.

Nam quanti refert te nec rectè dicere

Qui nihili faciat, quique inficias non eat.

Now it is plain by this plate, and what pass'd betwixt them, *Ac. 1. Sc. 3.* that *Ballio* means not by *nec rectè dicere*, that *Callidorus* and *Pseudolus* had abus'd him, and not spoke of him *well, rightly*, and *as they ought*, but that they had call'd him all to naught, as we say, which he confess'd to be true enough, but said he ear'd not for it. And now if *Mr. Leeds's Boys* know *rectè* to signifie nothing more than *well, rightly*, and *as one ought*, they know more than their Master: but then whatever may be said of *Mr. Leeds's* reading, he must be own'd to have the knack of Teach-



Teaching. But Mr. Leeds has a *Salvo* for all this, namely, that *rectè loqui* never signifies any thing, but to speak as one ought, and what that is in particular, the difference of the matter and occasion will discover. But this Objection I had obviated in the *Commentaries*, p. 3. where I say, that the utmost that can be made out from the use of *Latin Authors* is, that the Term *rectè loquendi* signifies speaking as one ought; but since here are several things which one ought to have regard to in speaking, it will never appear from this Definition, which of these in particular is the Subject of Grammar. And has Mr. Leeds made out the contrary? Nothing like it. He says indeed that *the difference of the matter, and the occasion will discover it*. Now where there is a Context to refer to, this may do something, but will it do so in a Definition, where nothing precedes but the word Defin'd? For instance, in this Definition of Grammar, *Grammatica est rectè loquendi atq; scribendi ars*, *Grammatica* is the only thing that precedes, and is to be explain'd by the Definition; and if that also will explain the Definition, 'tis a very grateful Age grown, and the Rule of one good turn requiring another, goes a great deal further than ever I thought of. But Mr. Leeds will not give it over so, for he says again, p. 5. *But admit that any word in the Definition of Grammar had more significations than there it has, if that signification in the Definition be the most obvious and common signification, the Definition is by no means to be found fault with, or condemn'd as doubtful and obscure*. But certainly an ambiguous Term must be very improper for a Definition, be the signification it there has, never so obvious. For what is most obvious in it self, is not therefore so to all Readers, some of which may have happened to have seen it oftener in its more uncommon signification, which will be therefore more obvious to them. And even of them that know its most common Use, some may not have that always uppermost, or may be induc'd by something or other to pitch upon the less obvious Use of it. I should think therefore, that a Term of one particular signification, when it can be had, would do much better in a Definition, and that

that this liberty of defining by ambiguous Terms, or Words of several significations, were never allowable, but when, as Mr. Leeds should have worded his Aphorism, the want of plainer Terms makes it necessary. But having no judgment of my own, I must leave it to him. Let us now see how this Rule, if granted, is applicable to the matter in hand. *Rectè loqui*, says Mr. Leeds, signifies to speak as one ought, but then this is a general signification, and has several particulars under it of very different intentions, and Grammar treats but of one of these particulars, namely the expressing the Relations of things. Now let Mr. Leeds shew me any one Passage out of any Author, where *rectè loqui* is us'd in this Sense, and I promise him, what he has no reason to expect, that I will not insist upon his proving that to be its most obvious signification. But he has another fetch after all, he says *the young Spark that goes to School to learn what Grammar is, never read any of these Authors, in which these words, viz. rectè loqui, are said by Mr. Johnson so to be used, viz. otherwise than in the Definition of Grammar, and has no occasion from thence to doubt of the signification of any of these words in the Definition of Grammar.* Well, I had always thought that a Definition was to instruct People, but Mr. Leeds has convinc'd me that 'tis only to impose upon them, and that the young Spark comes to School only to be put upon by the old One, and for that this Definition may be very proper; but then any one would have done as well. For the young Spark knows no Latin, and you may persuade him for a while to what you will, and I cannot understand upon these Terms why M. Leeds shou'd concern himself to defend, or oppose any Definition. If this be the Case, the *French Chirurgion's* is as good as the best, *Chirurgery is a quick and intrepid motion of the Hand to some convenient intent.* If there be any difference between these two Definitions, that of *Grammar*, which Mr. Leeds stands for, and this of *Chirurgery*, by the *Frenchman*, this latter has rather the Advantage. The Subject of each Definition is a certain particular, the Specifick difference

in

in this is an *individuum vagum*, some convenient intent, which is something nearer the matter than Mr. Leeds's *rectè loquendi*, a meer General. And if *Grammatica* will discover what Particular of the General is meant by *rectè loquendi*, *Chirurgery* will equally determine the *individuum vagum*, some convenient intent. And yet I fancy the Definition would fit the business of a Pickpocket or Jugler, as well as that of a Chirurgion, for they also have need of a quick and intrepid motion of the hand, and that, in their Opinion, to some convenient intent.

But Mr. Leeds says, p. 5, 6. that I advance a worse in the room of it. Well, if it be so, it must be stark naught I confess. Now my Definition is this, *Grammar is the Art of expressing the Relation of things in Construction with Orthography in Writing, and due Accent in Speaking, according to the Custom of those whose Language we learn.* Against this Mr. Leeds has several notable fetches. And first he says, that my Definition has one and Thirty words in it, if he tells right, and Lilly's but seven, and therefore he says Lilly's is the shorter Definition. Now I do not at all doubt but Mr. Leeds can tell one and Thirty as well as another Man, and that Lilly's Definition in number of words, is shorter than mine. But then it is short also of the thing Defin'd, and let Mr. Leeds make his best of that shortness. Is there any thing in my Definition more than Grammar consists of? Does Mr. Leeds pretend there is? No such matter; what then? Why it has one and Thirty words, and Lilly's but seven. But if mine defines Grammar, and Lilly's does not, mine is the shorter Definition for all that. There are indeed in mine nine words which might in strictness be left out, namely, *with Orthography in Writing, and due Accent in Speaking*, because the custom of those whose Language we learn implies all that: But since some might not have thought it full enough without them, I chose to add them for explanation sake. And if Mr. Leeds will be so good natur'd once in his Life to excuse me for that, he has his liberty in return to quarrel the rest, provided he don't deal by me,



as a Merry Author says the *Spartans* did by one of their Countrymen, that had the misfortune to use three words when two wou'd have done, condemn me to read over *Guicciardin's History*.

The next thing Mr. *Leeds* cavils at, is the obscurity of my Definition; and this he thinks is so ridiculous, that having repeated part of it, namely, *Grammar is the Art of expressing the Relations of things in Construction*, he says, bold Reader, don't laugh, but read on. Now what sort of Readers Mr. *Leeds* expects, he knows best, and how subject they may be to laugh, as well as himself; but what so great occasion is here for laughing? Do not Men in the Construction of Propositions in their Minds, apprehend things under certain Relations one to another? And is Speech any thing else but the outward expression of these inward apprehensions? And is not the means for doing this, the custom of those whose Language we speak? If this be not the business of Grammar, let Mr. *Leeds* say what it is. If it be, let him find out plainer Terms to express it by. I cannot but think that one of these two was his Business here; and to be so merrily dispos'd without doing either, shews such a forwardness to laugh without a Jest, as Men of so much Wit as Mr. *Leeds* are seldom given to. But the Gentleman was upon his Mettle, and who can help what will away? *Expression, Relation, Accent, Orthography*, are *English* words, he says, indeed, but some of them as hard to be understood as any in that Definition, which Mr. *Johnson* dislikes. But if all of them are not so hard, why are they all nam'd? And since he says some of them are so hard, why does he not say which those some are? *Expressing* sure is no such hard word, and *Relation*, though it may be unknown to Children in that Sense, yet it is frequently so us'd, and may be explain'd to them by Examples out of Writers, and common use, which of his *recte loquendi* can never be done. And as for *Accent* and *Orthography*, I cannot understand how they are harder in the Definition of Grammar, than in the Division of it,

E

where

where they are both us'd, and where Mr. Leeds treats of them both, without any exception to the hardness of the Terms. Surely this Gentleman must have some strange Privilege that no body knows of, who can so often, with so much Confidence, assume a Liberty to himself which he denies to others. I know no other Reason for this, but that of the Poet,

*Te nunc, delicias, extra communia censes  
Ponendum, quia tu gallina filius albae,  
Nos viles pulli nati in felicibus ovis.*

But Mr. Leeds thinks he comes over me at least, when he shews the word *Art* in my Definition to have as many significations as *rectè loquendi*. And to make all sure, he tells us what a many sorts of Arts there are, viz. the *Art of Brewing*, the *Art of Baking*, the *Art of Building*, the *Art of Painting*, the *Art of Printing*; the *Blacksmith's Art*, and the *Goldsmith's Art*; the *Taylor's Art*, and the *Shoemaker's Art*, and a great many other Arts besides. No doubt of it Mr. Leeds has observ'd a great deal in his time, to have all these Arts so ready at his Fingers ends, and the World is as much beholden to him for the Discovery, as he says it is to me for using this word *Art*, in my new Definition of Grammar, which the Author of the common Grammar had us'd before me. But I wonder amongst all these he should not have thought of the *Art of Fooling*, and given us at least an Example of it, if not a place in his Division of Arts: For this is certainly Fooling without Art. The *Genus* in a Definition is always a General word, and therefore the word *Art* does very well in that place. But the *Specifick* difference, which *rectè loquendi* in the Definition of *Lily*, and others, must be supposed to represent, ought surely to be signified by a Term of a *Specifick* Signification, if Language will allow it; and if not, by one which is at least sometimes us'd in the particular Signification of such *Specifick* Difference. But to imagine, that because the

Genus in a Definition may be properly represented by a General Term, therefore the Specifick difference may be so too, is a Notion, I believe, that never came into the head of any Man living, but Mr. Leeds; and of all the odd objections that ever were made, since Squabbling came up, this of Mr. Leeds, to say the least of it, is the most surprising. Whatever I might have done with my Rhetorick and my Geography, which Mr. Leeds twits me with, I cannot but fancy, he had as good have kept his Logick to himself. However, the Riddle is out now, why Mr. Leeds thinks Boys must needs go to the University to learn Logick. His parting blow here is about the word *Things* in my Definition, *Grammar is the Art of expressing the Relation of Things in Construction*; where by *Things*, he says, he cannot but think I mean *Words*, and then he has a notable descant, and extremely edifying about the different use of *Words* and *Things* in common acceptation, and says, *no body that he knows of says Things, when he means Words, except Mr. Johnson*. But it is plain Mr. Leeds has heard of many things of late, that he never heard or thought of before, which are very true for all that: But to deal plainly with him, I mean *Things*, and not *Words*. My reason is, because the *Relation of Words in Construction* is but the secondary end of Grammar, the *Relation of Things* is the Principal, and that which the *Relation of Words* is subservient to, and representative of. And let Mr. Leeds make his best on't, that I chose to Define rather by the main, than the subservient end. He says indeed, that he never heard of *things in Construction*, but in the building of a Wall, or such like, but I suppose that does not hinder, but others may. Mr. Leeds does not appear yet to be such a Standard of Reason, that nothing can be, that he has not heard of. Certainly there goes a Construction of *Things* in the Mind, before that of *Words* in Language, with all such as think before they speak; and tho' Mr. Leeds has bid fair by his loose arguing, for an Instance of the contrary, yet I suppose even that cost him some Forethought, or previous Construction of *Things* in his mind,



Mind, before it came to this *Construction of Words*, or else we should have heard of him in less than three Years time. But if there were no such matter as this *Construction of Things*, yet the *Relation of Things* may be the principal Matter in the *Construction of Words*; and if it be not, I desire Mr. Leeds to tell me what it is.

His next Fling is, at my Definition of a Substantive, viz. *A Substantive is the name of a Thing which may subsist by it self in the Understanding, so as to become the Subject of Predication.* And here the Objection is, that by the *Subject of Predication*, may be understood a *Preacher's Text*, and Mr. Leeds is grievously afraid the Boys will take it so, because they have not been at the University to learn *Logick*, and they have a *Logical signification* in my Definition. Well, but cannot Mr. Leeds prevent, or set right this Mistake? The words have certainly the signification which I here intend them; and tho' that be a *Logical signification*, cannot a Boy learn so much *Logick* before he goes to the University? I could tell Mr. Leeds some instances of this, where these two Birds have been kill'd with one Stone, namely, where Boys have learned *Logick* along with their *Grammar*, so much of it, that is, as has been requisite for the understanding of *Grammar*. And I would fain know of Mr. Leeds, where the harm of all this is? *Logick* is nothing but the Art of Reasoning, and *Grammar* is the Art of Expressing that Reasoning. Now what so proper, as to have the same common Terms between things so near allied, as the thing signified, and the thing signifying? If it be the Business of *Grammar* to represent the Relations of things, those Relations must have some Terms to signify them. And since these are already settled in *Logick*, which Boys that are made Scholars must learn, and are not harder to explain to them who go not so far, than many other *Grammar* Terms; sure they must be preferable for this Reason, as carrying the School-boy through good part of his *Logick*, before he sees any such thing as the System of it. *Sanctum* had such an Objection as this flung in his Dish, as appears

pears where he says, *At ista, inquis, à Philosophis sumis*, to which he answers, *Metueham ne à lenonibus diceret*. The next time Mr. Leeds writes upon this Head, let him answer what that Author says further upon this Matter: or if he think that too much, let him at least answer what he may find in the *Commentaries* to back this Definition, which I cannot imagine, why he shou'd have left altogether unconsidered, unless he has as great an Aversion for Logick in Reasoning, as in Grammar. And if it be so, I cannot much wonder at it; for Mr. Hobbs has observ'd, that when Reason is against a Man, a Man will be against Reason. However, I do not pretend any Necessity of teaching these Definitions to meer Children, nor do I practise it my self; a practical Description of things may serve the turn for a while, but when Reason comes on, as it does a long while before Boys go to the University, why they should not know all that is to be known, I believe very few can give a Reason, beside Mr. Leeds, nor he a better, than what he here gives us.

I define an Adjective to be a word added to a Substantive, to declare some additional Accident of the Substantive taken by it self, as of Quality, Property, Relation, Action, Passion, or manner of being, and I there give the best Reason I cou'd think of, why I so define it. And does Mr. Leeds say any thing against that? Not a word. Only additional Accident are hard words, he says, and Quantity is left out, not designedly, he supposes, and Property put in without any Reason, and the old Quarrel about Logical Terms he renews again. Well, Quantity I confess, was not left out with any Design, but Property was designedly put in, and I know not how the Possessives *Meus*, *Tuus*, *Suus*, &c. wou'd have been comprehended without it. As for his Objection against Logical Terms, I have answer'd it already, for the Reader's Satisfaction; but I have another Answer for Mr. Leeds, namely, that after all this Outcry against Logick, how clear so ever he keeps from it in his Arguments here, yet in his *Vossius*.

Contra-

*Contractus*, for the Use of his Boys, he is as deep in the Dirt, as I am in the Mire, for this intolerable Logick is to be found there too. And, tho' I suppose, few, or none, who are curious in these Matters, will be without such a sure Guide as Mr. Leeds's Book, yet, to save the Reader the trouble of turning, I will cite him the Passage. 'Tis his Note upon *Quum duo Substantiva*, &c. p. 126. *Posterius autem fere significat, vel materiam; totum; partem; subjectum; adjunctum, causam efficientem, finalem; objectum; correlatum; possessorem; tempus; locum; locatum.* Now what are all these, but Logical Terms, many of them surely as hard to be understood, as any he charges upon my Definitions; and *Subjectum*, one of them, which he finds fault with in my Definition of a Substantive? And yet of this Definition of an Adjective, he says, *It doth not seem possible ever to be understood by any one, that hath not first learn'd Logick; a preposterous way of teaching, first Logick, and then next Grammar; so that a young Man must go first to the University to see what the Predicaments are, and then come to a Grammar School to learn Mr. Johnson's Definition of an Adjective.* Well, and by this Rule so he must also, to know which must be the Genitive Case of the two Substantives. Surely after all this, such an Outcry against a Practice in another, which he uses himself, is such a Degree of Confidence, or Supineness, as is hardly to be met with, but in Mr. Leeds, and as monstrous every whit, as that which flung the Poet into that Rapture,

*O proceres, cenfore opus est, an aruspice nobis!*

*Scilicet horreret, majoraq; monstra putaret,*

*Si mulier vitulum, vel si bos ederet agnum.*

I define Gender to be the Inclination of a Substantive to one or more Terminations in the same Case of its Adjective; And upon this Mr. Leeds is as merry as the Maids. He says, p. 8. Now if the Case should be put thus, Riddle me, riddle me this. What is that which is the Inclination of a Substan-



*Substantive to one, or more Terminations in the same Case of its Adjective?* A Man might guess twenty times, before he said that which Mr. Johnson would have him. Well, I confess this is a very good Jest, and a sheer new one. But the Mischief of it is, Mr. Leeds mistakes the whole Matter. I am not there defining of Gender, as it signifies Sex, but as a Quality in a Substantive, which requires an Agreement in its Adjective, which for the Reasons there given, I call, for Distinction, its Grammatical Gender. And I would be glad to learn of Mr. Leeds, why a Substantive may not be said to be of this or that Genus or Gender in that respect, as well as Verbs in respect of *Action, Passion, &c.* I have given the best Reasons I could think of, in the *Commentaries* for this State of the Matter, but it is below a Man of Mr. Leeds's Figure, to consider any Body's Reasons but his own. But he says, I have not the Faculty of speaking plain; I hope, however in this others may happen to understand me, tho' Mr. Leeds don't, and for this, I refer the Reader thither.

His next Charge is, that, whereas I tax *Lilly* of Superfluities, I have yet more of them than *Lilly* himself. If he means, the Book is larger, I grant it, but then it is in order to have it shorter than *Lilly*, at least matter for matter, when it comes to be abridg'd. And this I have said as plain as I can speak, and answer'd this Charge in general, in the Preface to the Schoolmasters, and English Reader, and know of no Obligation I have to Mr. Leeds to repeat it here. Well, but what are the Particulars which Mr. Leeds excepts against in this respect? Why, he says, that he accounts for Superfluities, among the rest, my affirming and endeavouring to prove the Infinitive Mood to be a Noun, and Gerunds and Supines, to be the same. But does not Gerard Vossius do the same? Nay, does not Mr. Leeds the same himself from Gerard Vossius? Even the very same, p. 105. For, upon that of the Grammar, concerning Gerunds, *utrum ad verba, an ad participia*

*icipia propius pertineant, &c.* his Note is an Abstract of *Vossius's* Opinion, and is made up of eleven Lines, all to prove this Impertinence he here charges upon me; namely, that Gerunds are Nouns. Again, p. 165. he represents *Vossius's* Opinion and Arguments in ten Lines, for the proving of Supines to be Nouns. We have seen before, how Mr. *Leeds* has set up for Lord of the Mannor, for canvassing and taxing the Errors of great Men, and kept that Game for his own hunting; but now he extends his Royalty to Logical Terms, and to Gerunds and Supines, they are all within the Lordship, Royal Game all, and no Body must so much as put up but himself. And is not this now in his own Language, *a Ho-Mr. Leeds*. But after all his brave alls, I fancy when he writes again, if he takes care to read, and at last to examine his own Books, so as not to expose himself in this manner, many People will think he makes as great a Figure. Mr. *Leeds* complains, I take him for a meer Animal, but sure his sleeping forty Years together, and then waking no longer when he's jogg'd, than just to mend the misplacing of three words, as appears by p. 30. and so to sleep again, looks like a little Animal, which I suppose Mr. *Leeds* knows, whatever I take him for.

Page 110. he charges me thus. *The next thing Mr. Johnson has not done so well in, is in the same page; it is a very strange thing, I do not know well what to call it: He, I believe, if he saw it in another Man, wou'd call it a Blunder. He seems to approve of what Vossius has deliver'd concerning Proper Names of the Masculine Gender, and that because he used the word Mares, which comprehends the Males of Brutes, as well as those of Mankind: and yet, (is it possible) the same Mr. Richard Johnson blames Lilly for omitting the Proper Names of Brutes, when he uses the same word to comprehend them, that Vossius did: Propria quæ Maribus; Maribus, I say, Maribus tribuuntur, Mascula dicas. And p. 11. Nor is there any omission in Lilly's Grammar, as Mr. Johnson says there is, of telling Children of what Gender the Names of Mares*

Mares and Bitches are. For that is plainly and evidently in the first Line of the Rule next following, being join'd to part of the second: *Propria Femininum referentia Nomina Sexum, Femineo generi tribuuntur.* But since *Vossius* declares his Rule to be general, and to hold throughout, and *Lilly* joins several particular Instances to each of his Rules, which by the common manner of Construction in such Cases, may be understood as a Limitation of their Generality to those several Particulars; I can see no Blunder in preferring *Vossius's* wording himself, to that of *Lilly*, and even to charge this latter of not giving express Direction in this Case.

Page. 11, and 12. he has two notable Rebukes for me. I lay upon the word *Canopus*, that I know of no body, that has observ'd it to be Masculine, before me. Upon this, Mr. *Leeds* says, if I had been the first Discoverer, it had been more seemly to have stay'd 'till some body else had said so. This is a very grave Rebuke; but let us see how this *Rose of Modesty* behaves himself under like Temptation, and if you do not find him as meet Flesh and Blood, as poor Mr. *Johnson*, I am much mistaken. I might quote several Passages for this, but I shall content myself with one, not to bear too hard upon the Virgin Modesty of a bashful Author. It is in his Preface to his *Methodus Græcam linguam docendi, Si hoc videtur parum, dicam aliquantulum amplius, sed tibi soli, vir bone, qui sagacior es naso, idq; seorsim & in aurem. In hoc libello, ut ut exiguum est, invenies nonnulla, quæ frustra fortasse alibi quæres; nec ad puerum in Græcâ Linguâ instituendum desiderabis quicquam, quod te pigebit desiderare, aut si pigebit, quod non, in quolibet loco venalis, quilibet libellus abunde tibi suppeditabit.* Now according to Mr. *Leeds's* Construction, here is a Brag of several Discoveries together, and I know not how he will come off, but by saying, that vain Glory is a Trade where the Wholesale-man is more creditable than the Retailer. This is a *Whisper* indeed, he says, but then 'tis to a Man of a more sagacious Nose, than ordinary, and to



pick out such a one to brag to, is still greater bragging, and smells so strong of Vanity, if all things of this kind must needs be from Vanity, that a Man of no very sagacious Nose may easily smell it out, and I believe Mr. Leeds cannot but be sensible, that a printed Whisper is no such great Secret. I think I may safely leave it with the Reader, which Expression, his or mine, has the greatest Air of Vanity. But he says, after all, I am not the first Discoverer, for *Ferrarius* and *Stephens* had discover'd it before me. Well, at last then we have a late Discovery of Mr. Leeds's making. But where was this Discovery when he wrote his *Vossius Contractus*? There is never a word of it in that. He had not discover'd it then at that time, nor do I find he had taken any Note of it in his interleav'd Book, which is his come off about *Nycticorax*. The Discovery, in all likelihood, has been since the coming out of the *Commentaries*, or at the most, of the Specimen, and then he is beholden to me, and a certain Gentleman, the first Letter of whose Name, is *Spirit of Contradiction* for this Discovery. But for all appears yet, I am the first that discover'd the Use of it in the Feminine, out of *Solinus*, for I do not find his Dictionaries have any thing of it. And if that be a proud word, Mr. Leeds for me shall be the only Author without Discoveries. But he says, if I meant no more, than that I did not know of any body that had observ'd it before me, even *that is too much*, and an Instance of that in my own Book, which I condemn in *Lilly's*, namely, Superfluity. And again, upon the word *Pontus*, he says my taking notice that he had not done *Vossius* justice, in leaving out his Observation of the sole Masculine Use of this word, *is more than needs*, and therefore Reader tally on this other Addition as another unnecessary thing to be observ'd in Mr. Johnson's new Grammatical Commentaries. And now, Reader, let me but have the same Allowance of dealing by Mr. Leeds's *Vossius Contractus*, which yet was design'd, solely, or mainly, for the Use of Schoolboys, which he does with my *Commentaries*, which

were

were design'd to satisfy the Nation of the Necessity of a new Grammar, and the Care that had been taken in laying the Foundation of it; give me, I say, but the same Allowance, and it would be no hard matter to make a *Leodius Contractus* out of his *Vossius Contractus*. But how comes he off with his leaving out *Vossius's* Observation upon *Pontus*, and the Injustice he does him in it? Why, to a Miracle! he says, *all that may be, for ought he knows, but my taking notice of it was more than needed.* Well, I confess I never thought of this, I think I must beg Mr. Leeds's Pardon.

Pag. 12, 13, 14. he battles me again upon the Account I give of the words *Marathon*, *Trapezus* and *Ilior*.

Et inutile ferrum  
Cingitur.

I say, *Marathon* is found in the Masculine in *Stat. Theb. 5.*

Hic & ab asserto nuper *Marathone* superbum,  
Theſea Vidimus.

Or at least in that of the same Author,

*Et nondum Eoo calrum Marathonæ triumphæ.*

But Mr. Leeds says, it may be Neuter in both places. I say, if it had been Neuter in this last, it is not likely the Poet would have said *Marathona*, but *Marathon*. For that is the Rule in Neuters, that the Accusative be the same with Nominative. Now what says Mr. Leeds to this? Why that *Trapezunta* is the Accusative of *Trapezus*, and yet I have endeavour'd to prove *Trapezus* to be Neuter from that of *Pliny*, *Item Philocalia*, & *Liviopolis*, & à *Phar-nace M. Passuum Trapezus liberum, vasto monte clausum.* Whether *Trapezus* be Neuter or no, shall be consider'd by

and by, in the mean time, there is no such Necessity of supposing *Marathona* to be Neuter here, *Um* in the Accusative, being both Masculine and Neuter, whereas *Um* in the Nominative is Neuter only. And therefore here is no Necessity of supposing a Breach of the general Rule in the Declension of Neuters. But Mr. Leeds says, *it must be Neuter, rather than Masculine; forasmuch as there is no common Name of the Masculine Gender for the Adjective to be refer'd to: and there is Opidum for the Neuter, as every body knows.* But how does Mr. Leeds know that every body knows this? He himself has never said any thing of it till now, whatever he knew. And how will it follow that it can't be the Masculine Gender, because there is no common Name of that Gender for it to be refer'd to? Do the Names of Cities always follow the Gender of the Common Nouns, *Urbs*, or *Oppidum*? What account then will he give of the Masculines, *Agragas*, *Hippo*, *Narbo*, *Sulmo*, *Taras*, &c. Now if Names of Cities may be Masculine, either with respect to their Termination, or the Name of some Man from whom they are called, or some other reason unknown to us, why may not *Marathon* be one of these? And where is the consequence that it cannot be Masculine, because there is no common Name for City of the Masculine? but he says I make it Masculine only, whereas it is Feminine also in that of Ovid,

————— *Te maxime Theseu*  
*Mirata est Marathon* —————

Now surely I have the worst luck of any Man living, for I quote this very Passage to prove it to be Feminine also, p. 21. and yet this mighty Disputant charges me with saying nothing of it. The account I give of the word *Trapezus* is, that it is Masculine by Termination, and yet found Neuter in Construction in *Pliny*, as by the Passage above cited. To this Mr. Leeds says it is neither Masculine, nor Neuter, and that I have prov'd neither. Well,

this



this is a bad matter, to assert two things and prove neither of them, and though I have so great an Authority for it, and a great deal more, as that of Mr. Leeds, who has prov'd never a one of his Assertions hitherto, yet I being a little Man, and so to expect none of that Privilege, shall wave it at present, and stand upon my Defence. He says, as for the Masculine Gender, I bring no Proof from *Vossius*, of its being so used. Well, I confess I do not. But what then? Is parity of Reason of no force in Grammar, where Authority of Example cannot be had? Can Grammar ever attain its end, namely, of giving general Rules for all the necessary occasions of Speech, without this allowance? 'Tis requisite to know the Gender of these Nouns for them who are to write, or speak of these Places, or at least it may be requisite when Epithets are to be added to them. And then can any thing be so reasonable (where there is no express Authority) as to suppose them to be of that Gender, which other Nouns of like general signification, like Termination, and like Declension, are of? But Mr. Leeds says *Ferrarius* has put it down for a Feminine, and cited the Authority of one *Honterus* for it. But then Mr. Leeds also confesses that he was but a hobling Poet, if so, the answer is as hobling as the Poetry every whit. Wherefore leaving the Poet and the Logician to hobble together, I shall rather conclude with *Vossius*, that, since the Termination *us* in Greek Nouns, as these Names of Cities are, is Masculine, and we find *Pessinuntem ipsum, Pessinuntem violatum, spoliatum* in Cic. *Selinunte recepto* in Liv. *Sparsit Phycunta meritum sacras rapinas* in Luc. as by Commentaries, p. 23. that *Trapezus* may be used in the Masculine also, as by Termination, tho' with respect to *Urbs*, or *Oppidum*, as well as other Names of Cities, it may be allowable to joyn with it a Feminine, or Neuter Adjective. And this *Vossius* tells us was both his own, and the common Opinion of Grammarians. What then is become of this Author's Reverence for his great *Gerard*? He is not so great, I find, but Mr.

Leeds

*Leeds* can make bold with him, if there be no other way to have his fling at me. And now, Reader, woud'st thou ever have believ'd that this very *Mr. Leeds* had said the same thing himself after *Vossius*, which he here charges upon me? and yet it is even so, for *Voss. Contract.* p. 21. thus he says, *Sed in ūs, quæ Gracè exeunt in ovs, & ex ovs contracta sunt; ut Daphnūs, Pessinūs, Amathūs, Trapezūs, Opūs, Hydrūs, Phliūs, &c. facientia gen. per untos rationis terminationis, sunt Masculina, Cic. in Orat. de Arusp. resp. Pessinuntem ipsum vastārē, Ovidius tamen, Gravidam Amathunta metallis. Sed hoc καὶ ὁμόλογον.* You see, Reader, the World rubs as it did of old,

*Committunt eadem diverso crimina fato,  
Ille crucem pretium sceleris tulit, hic diadema.*

For the same thing this Man is made a Fool,  
That has his Pack of Hounds, and Bury School.

I warrant it shall be a warning to me, as long as I live, how I ever write after *Mr. Leeds* again. Well, but it may be *Mr. Leeds* has chang'd his mind, and these Animadversions are to be understood to be upon his own Book, as well as upon mine. Let us see therefore what Argument he brings for this change of Opinion, supposing that to be the Case. Why he says, if my Rule be good

*Proper: from Commons Gender take,*

neither this nor *Marathon* can ever be Masculine, because there is no Common Noun of that Gender for the Adjective to be refer'd to. This had been a home thrust indeed upon me, if I had given that Rule as holding Universally, but when I make several Exceptions to it, and particularly in the Names of Cities, which I say rather take the Gender of the Termination, than that of *Urbs*, &c. to argue from the Rule in this manner, shews such a want, either of Sense, or Shame, as is hardly to be met with in a Man of Letters. At this rate *Mr. Leeds* may well protest against the mingling of Logick with Grammar, since his skill in Grammar is in danger to be question'd,

on'd, if Logick must make a part of it. 'Twas but a little above, that he twitted me for not being the Discoverer that *Canopus* was Masculine, others had discover'd it before me. And now after all it seems there can be no such thing, as the Name of a City in the Masculine Gender. A little before, in the word *Marathon*, he charges me with not saying what I really do say, and here he charges me with saying what he himself says. Now what shall a Man do with such an Adversary, that will needs be writing, and when his own Book and mine are the only things in Controversy, will not read, or not mind, either one, or t'other? Well, but he is sure it is not Neuter, and my Quotation out of *Pliny* will not prove it, he says. Now my Quotation is *Trapezus liberum, vasto monte clausum*, and if that do not prove *Trapezus* to be Neuter, Mr. Leeds must mean something by proving that nobody else means. *Trapezus* is here the Nominative Case, and the Adjectives *liberum* and *clausum*, or the Adjective *liberum*, and the Participle *clausum*, as it may be M. Leeds will have it, are both Neuter, as having the Termination *um* in no other Gender in the Nominative Case; and I never heard of any other Proof of the Gender of a Substantive, but the Termination of the Adjective join'd with it. And though that may here be, and I suppose is, with respect to *oppidum* understood, yet as to the practice of Speaking or Writing, 'tis all one whether he that says so, have that in his mind, the Reader or Hearer knowing nothing of that. And if a Neuter Adjective may be added to *Trapezus*, with respect to *oppidum* understood, though not nam'd, then the Reader can be led into no material Mistake by being told that *Trapezus* is Neuter, unless it be false Concord in the Speaker for not intending it; and then Mr. Leeds has made one New Discovery, he has brought the *Doctrine of Intentions* into Grammar also. And after all, this mighty distinction, of the Adjectives being Neuter with respect to *oppidum* understood is in my Book. I say in the beginning of this Chapter, that

Names



Names of Towns sometimes take their Gender from *oppidum* understood, and beside the Example I there give, I say it is done in other Terminations also, though unobserv'd by *Grammarians*, and this of *Trapezus* is another Example of it. There can be no difference therefore between Mr. Leeds and me in this matter, but the necessity of *intention*, which I confess I did not think of. His next Charge against me is upon the Word *Ilion*, where he says, that having charg'd him with taking no notice of it with an Adjective of the Feminine Gender, I forget to say any thing of it my self. Let the Reader see *Comment.* p. 22. whether he cannot find,

*Tunc cum tristis erat defensa est Ilion armis.*

As for his Criticisms, to prove that it shou'd be *Ilios* here, and not *Ilion*, they are all of piece with the rest of his Arguments, and I shall not dilate upon them. For he confesses that it is so in all Books, and Grammar is to be a Key to Books: when therefore learned Men, convinc'd by Mr. Leeds's Criticisms, shall agree to alter the reading, I will so far alter the *Commentaries*. In the mean time let him answer his own Author, who in his first Book of *Analogy*. c. 12. having cited,

*Sed mihi quid prodest vestris disiecta lacertis  
Ilios? And——postquam alta cremata est  
Ilios?*

Says, *nisi in utroq; hoc Ovidii loco Ilion legi debet. Ita enim est in vet. M. S. S. optima Notæ, ac video id placuisse etiam Scaligero Notis in Catullum.* And yet these are the very two Places, by which Mr. Leeds wou'd prove that it ought to be read *Defensa est Ilios* in the other, not *Ilion*. Methinks he shou'd have consulted his Principal, before he had been so confident that *Ovid* could never say *defensa est Ilion*. If he had done so, he wou'd have seen that his incomparable Gerard never thought that *Ilion*

was

was an Adjective, as he does, but says, *i.e.* *Urbs lion defensa*, and makes no bones of it. Certainly if this Gentleman had minded any thing but the opposing of me, this could never have escap'd him.

In the Names of Rivers, I say that *Albis*, *Betis*, *Gelbis*, &c. are always Masculine, and yet the Termination *is* is Feminine in Latin, to shew that the Names of Rivers do not always take the Gender of the Termination, as *Vossius* imagines. For this Mr. Leeds falls upon me, p. 15. saying, there is no such matter, for that if the words that end in *is* were equally divided, he believes the Masculine to be more than the Feminine. I would not be he that should fall under Mr. Leeds's lash for such a clumsy Expression as this is, to talk of making a majority out of a Number, by equally dividing it. I know of nothing can match it, but an old Story I have heard of a Mayor, who being to moderate in the Suffrages of his Corporation, and finding the People a little obstreperous, and in disorder, bid them separate themselves together, and divide themselves equally, and the Major part should carry it. But the Mayor, no doubt of it, was an honest Gentleman, and meant well, and so does Mr. Leeds. Let us take him then by *equally divided*, to mean *fairly divided*, and see what will come of it. Now the Feminines in *is* are these that follow, as far as I can think of at present, *Ædis*, *Amussis*, *Apis*, *Avis*, *Bilis*, *Buris*, *Cassis*, *Classis*, *Clavis*, *Cratis*, *Cuspis*, *Cutis*, *Febris*, *Felis*, *Fidis*, *Foris*, *Lentis*, *Lis*, *Messis*, *Navis*, *Navis*, *Opis*, *Ovis*, *Pellis*, *Pelvis*, *Pestis*, *Præsepis*, *Puppis*, *Raris*, *Ravis*, *Restis*, *Rudis*, *Securis*, *Sementis*, *Sitis*, *Sortis*, *Turris*, *Tussis*, *Vallis*, *Vestis*, *Vis*, *Vitis*. And let Mr. Leeds, who is so good at *telling the Words in a Definition*, tell these right too, and then let him divide the Nouns in *is*, as *equally* as he pleases, and when he has found a majority of Masculines, I will see what may be brought in for a further Poll. He says here indeed, that he does but believe, that if the Nouns in *is* were equally divided, the Masculine wou'd be more than the Feminine.

But then he has a farther Argument to pin the Basket, and put the matter out of all dispute. For beside the twenty Masculines which he reckons up, he says, and in all Adjectives of two Terminations, the former of the two ends in *is*, and is Masculine as well as Feminine, and immediately upon this, concludes positively against me, that the Masculines in *is* are more than the Feminines. This therefore, says he, I would have put among the false things, which I promised to shew in Mr. Johnson's Book. Now, Reader, Sure I may return Mr. Leeds his Jest, upon my Definition of a Substantive, viz. Riddle me, Riddle me, Riddle me this : What Number is that, which being taken as often on one side as t'other, yet makes a majority of one side? I fancy a Man might guess not only twenty times, but his life time, before he hit upon it, or ever imagin'd, that the Man that had such a Notion, was either Logician, Arithmetician or Grammarian. What, to make a Majority between two Candidates by double Votes! And to make this a further instance of the falsities of Mr. Johnson's Book; this was a fetch beyond old Simo's. *Nunquam quivi ego isthuc intelligere. Vah consilium callidum.*

I say *Cupressus* is supposed by *Vossius* and his Followers to be Masculine only in *Ennius*, but that it is Masculine also in *Celsus*. To this Mr. Leeds's says, p. 15. That it does not follow that they supposed it to be Masculine no where else, but it may be, neither of them knew, or that time thought of any other place. Well, *qui bene distinguit, bene disputat*, and this must be own'd to be a nice distinction of Mr. Leeds, between their supposing it to be the only place, and its being the only place they knew of. But what Service is there in this mighty distinction, either to the Credit of these Authors, or to the Satisfaction of the Reader? Certainly if they did not suppose it, they ought to have supposed it; because they ought to have read so carefully, that what they found not, they might suppose was not to be found. And whatever Mr. Leeds supposes, I fancy the Reader will be apt to suppose that they did



did so. And it is probable all the Grammarians have supposed so, none of them having discover'd this place in *Celsus*, which in likelihood some of them wou'd have done, if they had not supposed that this matter had been thoroughly examin'd by those that wrote before them, and especially by *Vossius*, whose industry in this matter is so notorious. I confess Mr. *Leeds* has given us many Instances that we are not to suppose so in his Writings, nor that they are a Contraction of *Vossius*, which Title they bear. Amongst others, his Doctrine of the Preterperfect of *Neco* is one. For whereas *Vossius* says, *Necuit dixit Ennius, quod & apud Priscianum in IX.* by which he plainly intimates *Necavi* to be the common Preterperfect, his Contracter says, *Necavi habet Cicero in Verrem*, as if that were the only place, and *Necui* the common Preterperfect; and yet there are fifty four Examples of *Necavi*, and but two of *Necui*. In like manner *Vossius* says, *Nectum in supino non legitur, praterquam in Compositis*, his Contracter lets *Necui Nectum* in the Grammar pass without Remark. But before these Discoveries, who wou'd have thought that Mr. *Leeds* had read so little, as to be guilty of those gross Mistakes, so easily discoverable by any reading? Surely it was more natural to suppose, that, if there had been any such place, he would have taken care to have found it, or at least some out of so many. But for me Mr. *Leeds* shall have the Benefit of his own distinction, I will not say that he supposed there was such a Participle as *Nectus*, and not *Necatus*, or that *Necavi* was extraordinary, and to be found only in *Cic. in Ver.* but that he had never found otherwise in his reading, or had forgot it. But then one thing we may suppose, namely, that even this one Example of *Necavi* was not found out by Mr. *Leeds's* reading, but borrowed from *Farnaby*, who has the very same, and Mr. *Leeds* acknowledges he makes use of *Farnaby* in this Work. But Mr. *Leeds* is much concern'd that I have nam'd *Vossius*, and Mr. *Walker*, as having not observ'd this Place of *Celsus*. I have given my Reasons already for naming of Names,

and if I should here say further, that I was desirous it might be seen what pains I had taken, that so some consideration might be had of them, I know not how Mr. Leeds could blame me. He has done so frequently himself, as I have shewed before, and for further Instances, take these which follow, Rhemius & Westmonasteriensis Grammatica Scriptor addunt etiam εἰς τὰ ἄλλα, sed qui ea voce utuntur nullum citant authorem, Meth. Græc. Lingu. doc. p. 57. Et aoristus primus apud Atticos Scriptores nonnunquam poni reperitur pro Futuro Indicativi ut δέξασθαι pro δέξαις, ut ut id improbat, Hen Stephanus, Ibid p. 51. Gram. Westm. dicit sæpius scribi παρρησιάζω, sed alit. Gr. lib. p. 59. Atque ut volunt Gaza & Sylburgius παρρησιάζω, licet haud sciamus an uspiam reperiundum παρρησιάζω inter Græcos Scriptores. p. 91. And again he contradicts Moquotus by Name, p. 107. Now Mr. Leeds, it seems, can name Names as well as other People, when he has any to name. This is Mr. Leeds's Practice, Reader, now let us see his Rule which he so gravely prescribes to me. And if Mr. Johnson knew of another Place (i. e. where Cupressus is used in the Masculine) it had been much more commendable to set it down without naming Vossius or Mr. Walker; who as he would have the World believe, knew nothing of it: he had thereby avoided the Crime which he charges upon Lilly, of being superfluous, and that which is worse, of something, if it be not that, which looks very like boasting or bragging, which every Wise Man shuns, what he can, the very appearance of. Now if the contradicting former Authors by Name must needs be bragging and boasting, surely I may at last say to Mr. Leeds with Thais, Si ego dignus hæc contumeliâ sum maxime, at tu indignus qui faceres tamen. Of all Men in the World Mr. Leeds should have held his Tongue, who is notoriously guilty of the same Practice. His finishing stroke in this Paragraph, is, That as in these my large, large, large Commentaries, there is something too much, so there is something too little, in that being too much intent to shew that Celsus as well as Ennius, had used Cupressus in the

the Masculine, I have forgot to say that it is Feminine at all. But what need had I to say it was Feminine? Does not the Grammar, which my *Animadversions* are upon, say it? And do I contradict it? Now I suppose, in writing of Notes, what a Man does not contradict, he is suppos'd to grant, and I shall be oblig'd to Mr. Leeds, if he will be so kind as to give me any better Rule for the future. In the mean time, Mr. Leeds's Fate meets with him here too, namely, to be always blaming what he does himself. For he also upon this Rule says, *Cupressus, platanus, & populus erant Masculina veteribus*, without taking any notice that they were Feminine at all. But he says, *I do it better in the Abridgment, or some body for me, for there I say Cupressus commonly Feminine, is also Masculine in Ennius and Celsus*. But sure, since I leave that part of the Rule uncontradicted in the *Commentaries*, which says it is Feminine, I say in effect, that it is Feminine also, and that plain enough to any body's Understanding, which the Book at large was design'd for. And if in the Abridgment, which was design'd for the Use of meer Children, I am more express, why must Mr. Leeds needs suppose some body else did it for me? I do not find he supposes any such thing of the Book it self, I may have wrote that, for any thing Mr. Leeds supposes to the contrary. And is Abridging such a mighty Work, that a Man may not do it of his own Book, as well as Mr. Leeds of that of another Man? But Mr. Leeds's Work has been abridging here, and I find every Crow thinks its own Bird fairest, and so let them think for me.

Pag. 16, 17. Beside what he chargeth me with for misrepresenting *Vossius*, and others, about the Signification of *Thus* (which I have acknowledg'd, and excus'd, the best I cou'd) he says, that whereas I say, that *Thus* hardly appears by what is alledg'd by *Vossius*, to be put for a Tree, it appears even as much, as by what is alledg'd by Mr. *Johnson*. That which Mr. Leeds thinks *Vossius* has prov'd it by, as plainly as I have done, is his Quotation  
of



of *Lignum Thuris* out of *Pliny*; and my Quotations for the Proof of it, are, *Cortex Thuris*, frequently us'd by *Celsus*, and a Passage out of *Pliny*, where speaking of the *Libanotis*, N. H. L. 19. cap. ult. he says, *Radice[m] habet olusatris, nihil à Thure differentem*. Now this last, at least, is certainly a better Proof that *Thus* is us'd for the Tree, than that of *Vossius*, which Mr. *Leeds* contends for. And I cannot but fancy, if Mr. *Leeds* had not thought so, he wou'd have said something to it, and not have left it wholly out, as he has done. And now, let me ask Mr. *Leeds*, or any of his Friends for him, if it had not been a great deal better, and more becoming a candid and civil Writer, to yield up the Point upon this Passage, which clears the Matter in dispute, tho' the other shou'd fail, than to single out *Cortex Thuris*, against which he thought he had a better Advantage, and to put upon his Reader, as if I had brought no other Proof? But let us see what Advantage Mr. *Leeds* has in that. He says, if *Lignum Thuris* may signifie, or imply no more than *Lignum ferens Thus*, or unde *Thus manat*; so may also *Cortex Thuris* imply no no more, than *Cortex illius ligni quod Thus fert*, or unde *Thus manat*. And does Mr. *Leeds* think this an Argument against me? I am the unluckiest Man in the World, if it be. Surely it wou'd make for any body else in my Case. Why, I say the same thing, namely, that it signifies *Cortex illius ligni* or *arboris quod Thus fert*, and by consequence, that by *Cortex Thuris*, is meant *Cortex arboris Thuris*, or *Thurifera*, and not *Cortex gummi Thuris*, or qui *Thus fert*. And that Trees are sometimes distinguish'd by the Name of their Fruit in the Genitive Case added to *Arbor*, we have an Example in that of *Cicero pro Flac. Arborem fici*; but that Barks are ever so distinguish'd, lies upon Mr. *Leeds* to prove. But Mr. *Leeds* makes use of this place of *Cicero*, to prove, that in *Arbor Thuris* of *Pliny*, *Thuris* is put for the Tree, and that *Vossius* brings this place to prove it, which I have pass'd by, as not conducing to my purpose, which I had to make my self, (as in many other places

places of this Book, I too apparently strive to do) seem to be able to discover more than Vossius had done. Well, if I do so, it is no more than Mr. Leeds has here, and in other places, done by me. But let us see, First, whether Vossius brings it as any such Proof. Secondly, whether it really be any such Proof, as Mr. Leeds pretends it is. For the First, it is more likely that Vossius alledges it to a quite contrary Purpose : For having said, that Pliny uses Thus for the Frankincense-Tree in those Expressions, *Virgas Thuris*, and *Lignum Thuris*, he subjoins, *Sed & ab eodem quærupias vitanda causa, Thuris Arbor vocari solet, quomodo Cicero etiam fici arborem dixit pro fico.* Now I take *Sed* here to be a Discretive, and to intimate a different manner of expressing the same thing, because he says of this Expression in particular, namely, *Arbor Thuris*, that Pliny us'd it to avoid an Homonymy, or Equivocal Term. He must therefore suppose some Difference in this Form of Expression, from that of *Lignum Thuris*, which signifying in his Opinion, the Wood of the Frankincense-Tree, what can this Difference in the manner of Expression be, but that by *Arbor Thuris*, Pliny means the Tree of the Gum Frankincense, or which produces that Gum? This I then took, and do still take, to be the meaning of Vossius in this place; and not, as Mr. Leeds wou'd have it, that he hereby gives us a very good Reason why we should think Thus to signifie the Frankincense-Tree. And as it is probable, that Vossius meant as I have explain'd him, so it seems to me, that he was mistaken if he meant otherwise : For to distinguish a Tree, by the Genitive Case of its Product is allowable, as Servius calls the *Spinus, Prunorum Arbor* : But to distinguish it by the Genitive of the particular Species, as *Arbor ulmi*, or the like, is, I believe, unheard of. And now Mr. Leeds has my Reason for leaving out this Passage of Vossius; let him see how he can fix his Malice upon it, so as to persuade any candid Reader, that I did, as he charges me, leave it out as not conducing to the purpose I had to make my self seem to be able to discover more than Vossius had done.

The

The next thing he finds fault with upon this word, is That I tax the common Grammar of inexcusable Ignorance, for saying, that *Thus* for the *Tree*, is the Neuter Gender. He says there is the Authority of *Analogy* for it, there being, *Hoc Crus Cruris*, *Hoc Fus Juris*, *Hoc Pus Puris*, *Rus Ruris*. Now do but see, Reader, what a grievous Disadvantage poor little Mr. Johnson lies under, in comparison of great Mr. Leeds. In the Names of Cities, which he agrees take their Gender rather from the Termination, than the general Noun *Urbs*, I had said that *Trapezus* was Masculine, as being of like Signification, Termination, and Declension, with *Pessinus*, *Selinus*, and *Phycus*, which I had prov'd to be Masculine, and yet in this Mr. Leeds opposes me. But here in the Names of *Trees*, which take the Gender of *Arbor* much more commonly, than of the Termination, all of a sudden Termination and Declension are to carry all before them, and *Thus* must be Neuter, tho' the Name of a *Tree*, for the sake of *Fus*, *Crus*, *Pus*, which are no Names of *Trees*, and in spite of *Hic Mus Muris*, *Hec Tellus Telluris*. I should think, since there is no Authority for its Gender, it were more allowable to use it in the Feminine, as almost all the Names of *Trees* are used, than in the Neuter for the sake of *Rus*, *Crus*, *Fus*, *Pus*, especially since it appears by *Tellus*, that this manner of Declining does not reject the Feminine. And in this manner Mr. Leeds himself argues, when he has not me to oppose. For upon the words *Amis* or *Tudes*, *Vof. Contract. p. 32.* he says, *Cujus generis sint id incertum omnino reliquerunt autores, ideo tutius in his abstinere adjectivo certi generis, verum si alteruturo uti cogeret necessitas, uterer potius virili, quia in es exeuntia, quae in obliquis crescunt, prope omnia sunt Masculina.* If therefore in Nouns, which take their Gender from the Termination, where express Authority is wanting, we should follow the Gender of the major Part, why should not we do the like in the Names of *Trees*, the major Part of which take the Gender of *Arbor*, not of the Termination?



tion? Mr. Leeds quotes the learned Annotators against me at another time, but here they are for me, *Cujus generis sit* Thus *pro arbore ex veteribus doceri nequit; quare sine causâ à Grammaticis inter Neutra reponitur*. And since the common Grammar delivers *Thus* for a Neuter, for which there is no Authority, and that without Distinction, among other Neuters of Trees, for which there is Authority, the Ignorance is inexorable, and never the less so for what Mr. Leeds has said. What he says farther in this Paragraph upon this word, is so very trifling, that I suppose no Reader will expect an Answer to it.

The next Charge is about the *Epicene Gender*, p. 18. And the Indictment runs thus; *The next thing wherein I cannot tell how to reconcile Mr. Johnson to himself, is what he says of the Epicene Gender, p. 2. of his Specimen; namely, that under it are comprehended the Names of all living Creatures but MAN; and yet, p. 56. of the same Book, he blames Mr. Leeds very gravely, for having said, that he did not allow the word Homo to comprehend both Sexes.*

Now where is the Inconsistency here, that makes it so hard to reconcile Mr. Johnson to himself? Or what hinders but that these two Propositions may set their Horses together well enough? Namely, *The Epicene Gender comprehends under it the Names of all living Creatures but Man. Mr. Johnson blames Mr. Leeds, because he will not allow the Word Homo to comprehend both Sexes.* How comes this latter then to be brought in with a *Yet* Mr. Johnson very gravely blames Mr. Leeds, &c. Surely here is no place for yet, unless one of these two Propositions contradict the other. For *Homo* may be excepted out of the Number of *Epicenes*, and yet comprehend both Sexes, for ought appears by either of these two Propositions, unless by the Nature of Latin Language, all Nouns which signify both Sexes, must needs be *Epicene*, which is not certain. But Mr. Leeds says, if *Homo* comprehends both Sexes, and yet be Masculine only, then no doubt it

is Epicene ; and he says, p. 51. where he has more to this purpose, that in the Abridgment of the Specimen, I say 'tis never Feminine. Well, but do I say it is Masculine, when apply'd distinctly to a Woman ? Or does Mr. Leeds say so either ? Or can he prove it, if he says so ? 'Tis never Feminine indeed, that I know of, but then it is never Masculine neither, when apply'd particularly to a Woman. This then being the very Notion and Meaning of an Epicene, that it signifies either Sex under one and the same Gender, and no body having yet prov'd that *Homo*, when a Woman is signify'd, is Masculine (tho' *Vossius* has sufficiently disprov'd the Arguments yet brought for its being Feminine) it remains a Doubt still, whether *Homo*, when apply'd to a Woman, be Masculine, and I might well enough except it out of the *Epicenes*, as a doubtful Matter. And if this be a good Reason, as I hope it may, then Mr. Leeds is oblig'd to me, at least, for this Discovery ; for he concludes this Paragraph thus, *Why may not hic Homo be the Epicene Gender also, when it contains in it both Sexes, the Woman no less than the Man ? Let Mr. Johnson tell it if he can, for I can't.* Thus much, supposing I had really said, that under the *Epicene Gender* were contain'd the Names of all living Creatures but *Man*. But it is as plain, as plain can be, that I am there enumerating the Genders according to the vulgar Opinion, and that, in particular, of the Grammar I examine. And it is certain, whether Mr. Leeds can tell it, or no, that several Grammarians exclude *Homo* from the *Epicene Gender*, or else why does *Vossius* take such pains to disprove them. But as for me, I plainly strike the *Epicene* out of the Genders, and give my Reasons for it ; which if Mr. Leeds can answer, he will have an Advantage of me there ; but as the Case stands, I think he has none. But he reproaches me for endeavouring to give him and the World a needless Instruction, that the word *Homo* may be apply'd to a Woman as well as a Man, of which he says, here

here he is sufficiently convinc'd ; and afterward, p. 50, 51. that I misrepresent his Meaning, in what I quote from him, to prove that he deny'd *Homo* to signifie both Sexes, and that no Man of any Candor or Justice, wou'd, or cou'd have given himself leave to put such a Construction upon his Words, as I have done. Well, let this be seen by the words themselves, p. 22. of his *Vossius Contractus*, speaking of the Gender of the Termination *Um* as generally Neuter, he says, *è nominibus in um demas propria virorum, ut Pægnium, Dinacium ; Mulierum, ut Glycerium, Phronesium, juxta regulam vulgo à pueris cantatam,*

*Um Neutrum ponas, hominum si propria tollas.*

And then subjoins, *Licet vix agnoscimus vocem hominem includere utrumq; sexum.* Now what can be made of this Note, but that which I make of it ? It contains an Adversative Sense to *Um neutrum ponas, hominum si propria tollas.* And if so, it must either contain something contrary to the Rule in the Terms of the Rule, or to some Inference, which he would prevent being drawn from the Rule. Now in this latter Case it is ever necessary, to put down such Inference expressly and distinctly, otherwise the Reader can never know what Inference is meant. And is there any such thing done here ? Nay, is not the contrary done ? Does not *includere utrumq; sexum*, signifie the taking in of both Sexes, answerable to the Signification of *Hominum* in the Rule ? And does not his saying, *è nominibus in um demas propria virorum, ut Pægnium, Dinacium ; mulierum, ut Phronesium, Glycerium*, to which he applies this Rule of *Um neutrum ponas*, &c. as equivalent, imply that by *Hominum* in the Rule, was meant neither more, nor less, than the Names of *Virorum*, & *Mulierum* ? Since therefore he does not expressly caution against any Inference that might be made of the Gender of *Homo*, he must be understood to except against the Use of *Homo*, as



in the Terms of the Rule, or, which is all one, to suppose it not to comprehend both Sexes. And let Mr. Leeds mean what he will to himself, he plainly says thus to every body's Understanding, who understands the Nature of an Adversative, or Restrictive Proposition, call it which he will, and will be understood accordingly, till he shall be pleas'd to gratifie the World with a Key, or particular Grammar for his Forms of Speech. He has said indeed formerly, by way of Advertisement, that he could not well be suppos'd to be so ignorant, as not to know, that *Homo* included both Sexes, since there is in the Grammar, *nec vox hominem sonat*, O Dea certè!

Now I am not so forward to charge every Mistake upon habitual Ignorance, as Mr. Leeds is; but however, this is no Proof that he was not ignorant of it at that time. For, there is in the Grammar also, *Argricolam arbor ad frugem producta delectat*. and yet Mr. Leeds says, that this Noun, in the signification of Fruit has no singular Number, tho' there be as many Instances beside to prove the contrary, as to prove that *Homo* signifies a VVoman also. And therefore he cannot say, that I have lost my Labour in *instructing the World* in that too, since he at least may be instructed by it, who before the coming out of the *Commentaries* positively deny'd it. There is also in his own Grammar, or *Vossius Contractus*, from *Farnaby*, that *Obsolevi* is the only Preterperfect of *Obsoleo*, and yet upon occasion, he forgets his *Farnaby*, and says, *Quæ prorsus Obsoleverunt Meth. Græc. Lingu. docend. p. 44.* And then surely Mr. Leeds might as well forget *nec vox hominem sonat*, as these two. It were easie to go on with this Author at this rate, all that follows, excepting one Particular only, affording equal Advantage, as shall be made appear hereafter, if Mr. Leeds require it, but I shall stop here at present, for several Considerations.

First, Because the Book is grown as big already, as any Reader, in likelihood, will be content to read in a Contro-

versie

versie which has so little of Instruction. Secondly, because the Bookseller is unwilling to venture the Printing of more. Thirdly, because Mr. Leeds is an Old Man, and it may seem invidious to push things with him as far as they will go. And this consideration indeed had put a stop to this answer, if I had found Mr. Leeds some years ago, either in his Arguments, his Latin or his Manners, 'ere a whit better than he is at present. But when I found him talking heretofore at the same loose rate, faltering in his Latin, as in *pago Northumbriensi optimè de se meritâ*, Meth. Græc. Lingu. Dedic. for *merito*; *Dixit autem ille, qui priorem commodaverat, alterum se posse mihi mittere si modo, postquam satis usus fuero, non graverer domino remittere*, Indic. Cathol. Præf. for *si usus essem, or fuissém*, which shall suffice at present. When I consider'd this, I say, and his unmannerly usage of Mr. Hoadly, long since, I concluded him to be the same Mr. Leeds, that he always was, and that Age had made no other Alteration, than rivetting and confirming what he had in his younger days; and thought my self at liberty to deal with him as he had provok'd me to do, and yet I have not gone so far as that. But beside this I have reason to suppose, that there was a much younger Man joyn'd with him; and if so, they know best what belongs to each, let them share it amongst them. I shall only say,

*Egregiam vero laudem, & spolia ampla tulisti,  
Tuq; puerq; tuus.* —————

Here are Fifty six Pages of meer fiddle faddle, hardly a word by which the Reader can be the Wiser, or the better understand the Business of Grammar; no one Errour assign'd, which I have any reason to own, but in the word *Sicanis*, which I too heedlessly said was Masculine, as well as Feminine, whereas being a Patro-

Patronymick, it is only Feminine, as he says rightly. But because the whole Controversy between Mr. Leeds and me, is upon the Comparative; I shall, to stop his Mouth, state the Account between us, by way of Debtor and Creditor, by which it will appear with how much modesty Mr. Leeds sets up for a Dunn, when he is so much more in my Debt. I shall go no further at present than this Examination, and when Mr. Leeds thinks fit to add his threatned more, I shall also bring the Remainder to Account. As for what he charges for Mis-quotations, I shall send him back to his own here, p. 16, 17. for Payment, for the Misprints, *Hyp. Delus*, and *Bisons*, let him look to his own *Epicane* thrice, p. 18. of his *Animadversions*, to *climati* and *climatide* for *clemati*, &c. p. 47. of his *Vof. Contr.* and others, too mean all to be taken notice of, but in answer to so mean a Caviller; let him do this, and then the word *Sicanis* is the only word I am indebted to him for.

Richard Johnson, Debtor to Mr. Edward Leeds.	Mr. Edward Leeds, Debtor to Richard Johnson.
---	---

For <i>Sicanis</i> Mas. only. 1	For <i>Pelion</i> Mas. 1
	For <i>Ilion</i> Fem. <i>Marathon</i> } 2
	Mas. }
	Mas. and Fem. Terminations in the Names of } 1
	Cities Neuter for the sake of <i>Oppidum</i> . }
	<i>Canopus</i> Mas. and Fem. 2
	Proper Names of Ships } 2
	and Fables. }
	For Names of Cities in } 1
	um, Fem. }
	For <i>Pontus</i> and <i>Sason</i> , Mas. 2
	For <i>Cupressus</i> Mas. in } 1
	<i>Celsus</i> also. }
	For



Richard Johnson Debtor to  
Mr. Edward Leeds.

Mr. Edward Leeds Debtor  
to Richard Johnson.

For Nouns in *os*, of the  
1<sup>st</sup> Special Rule, Fem. } 13

For Nouns in *us*, Fem. 14

For *Camelus*, Fem. 1

For *Amaracus*, *Citifus*  
Doubtful. } 2

For Nouns in *um* and  
*on*, Fem. } 19

For *Linter* Mas. in *Cato* 1

For *Callis* Mas. only. 1

For *Canalis* as well Mas.  
as Fem. } 1

For *Calx* a Goal, Doubtful. 1

For *Paradisus* Mas. only. 1

For *Pugio*, *Scipio*, *Titio*,  
*Unio*, Mas. only, and  
*Lux* not Fem. only. } 5

For *Restis*, Fem. only. 1

For *Adamas* Fem. *Bison*  
Mas. } 2

For *Grex* Fem. in *Lucretius* 1

For *Nycticorax*, *Dropax*,  
*Mystax*, *Varix* mis-  
plac'd. } 4

For *Rhus*, *Sil*, Neut.  
*Rhus*, Fem. } 3

For the Gender of *Bos*,  
and *Custos*. } 2

For *Princeps*, Fem. 1

For *Agoceras*, *Buceras*,  
Neut. *Chamærops*, *If-*

*chemon*, *Lagopus*, *Mer-*  
*ges*, *Potamogiton*, *San-*  
*dix*, *Scandix*, *Smilax*,  
*Vitex*, Fem. *Anas* Fem.  
only. } 12

For

Richard Johnson Debtor to  
Mr. Edward Leeds.

Mr. Edward Leeds Debtor  
to Richard Johnson.

For *Atriplex*, Fem. 1

For *Histris* Mas. also. 1

For *Culex*, *Ramex* Mas. }

only ; *Rumex*, *Tra-*  
*dux*, *Varix*, Doubt. }

104

Ballance

103

O tandem insano parcas insane minori !

## FINIS.

### ERRATA.

PAGE 4. l. 21. dele *it*. p. 10. l. 3. read *vellicandam* ;  
ib. l. 8. after *Leodibus* add *at*. p. 11. l. 14. r. *galli-*  
*na* ; ib. l. 34. r. *Ulysses*, *Ulysse*. p. 14. l. 4. for *shall* here,  
r. *here, shall*. p. 25. l. 20. r. after *full* ; ib. l. 22. *tha* r. *that*.  
p. 27. l. 16. after *his* add [ ) ]. p. 30. l. 8. for *here* r. *there*.  
p. 34. l. 10. r. *infelicibus* *ovis*. p. 40. l. 12. after *pus* add  
*them*. p. 43. l. 21. for *calrum*, r. *clarum*.

### ADVERTISEMENT.

Grammatical Commentaries, the Book here in Dispute,  
is sold by S. Keeble at the Turk's-Head in Fleet-street ;  
J. Taylor, J. Knapton, D. Midwinter, in St. Paul's  
Church-Yard ; G. Sawbridge in Little-Britain, and  
G. Scrahan in Cornhill.